



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Per. 971 e. $\frac{130}{5s_2}$



THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE.

EDITED BY

B. HARRIS COWPER,

EDITOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FROM CODEX A; COMPILER OF A SYRIAC GRAMMAR; TRANSLATOR
OF S. CHRYSOSTOM ON THE PRIESTHOOD; ETC., ETC.



VOL. II. (FIFTH SERIES.)

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1868.

LONDON :
MITCHELL AND HUGHES, PRINTERS,
WARDOUR STREET, W.

NOTICE.

OUR readers will remember that twelve months ago we announced our intention to suspend the publication of this Journal, in consequence of inadequate support. Subsequently, however, arrangements were made which led to the resolution to issue it at least for one year more, by way of further experiment. That experiment has been tried, and the result is, that the present number of THE JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE will be the last. The times are evidently unfavourable for an expensive serial, appearing at distant intervals, limited both as to its subjects and the mode of treating them, and therefore appealing to the patient, the learned, and the thoughtful. Such a serial is scarcely suited to the habits and temper of the day, and inasmuch as it cannot be made the organ of a party, its extinction is only a natural event. The first number appeared in January, 1848; it has therefore existed twenty years, and we bring it to a conclusion with the satisfaction that it has rendered some service to the cause of truth, and the conviction that it will not cease to be valuable to the earnest and impartial student. Thanking all our generous contributors and supporters, we accept the position in which Providence has placed us, and hope for other opportunities of usefulness.

I N D E X

TO

VOLUME II. (FIFTH SERIES).

- Abbey, the, of the Holy Ghost, 8.
Abyssinia and Prester John, 504.
Ahaz, butter and honey a sign of evil to, 337; Henry quoted on, 348.
Alford, Dean, on the characteristics of St. Paul, 164, *note*.
Alphabet, the invention of the, 178.
Ambrose, S., and Theodosius, 74.
Analogies of Being, the, 480.
Ancren Riwele, the, 9; its author, 9; quoted, 11, 12.
Anointing, 76, 96.
Ante-Nicene Christian Library, 222.
Antiquaries, Society of, 351.
Apocalypse, the, an early English view of, 16.
Athanasius, arrival of in Rome, 61.
Augustine and forensic imputation, 173.
Augustine and Jerom, 63.
Ayenbite of Inwoyt, the, 15.
Barnabas, the epistle of, quoted, 372.
Basil, St., the life of, 72; De Broglie quoted on, 73; compared with Gregory, 72.
Basilides, De Groot on, 485.
Beatitudes, lectures on the, 492.
Beautiful Gate of the Temple, the, 33, 43.
Bedarride, M., quoted on the character of the Talmud, 255.
Being, the analogies of, 480.
Bible, the English, 491.
Bible, the natural history of the, 486.
Bibliander and the Vatican Testament, 245.
Bonney, T. G., on the taxing, 77.
Books, new, 237.
Bosanquet, J. W., on Messiah the Prince, 428, 483.
Böttcher's Hebrew Manual, 221.
Broglie, De, recent books by, 59; the Church and the Empire during the fourth century, 70, 73; quoted on St. Basil, 73; on the council of Constantinople, 73.
Brooks, Thomas, the works of, 223.
Brückner, Dr., on the invention of the alphabet, 178; on the Transfiguration of Christ, 368.
Butler, Prof., on eternal punishment, 156, *note*.
Butter and honey a sign of evil, to Ahaz, 337.
Buxtorf on the Jesu of the Talmud, 279.
Canons, the apostolic, 485.
Canterbury, St. Edmund of, some account of, 6.
Canterbury, Dan Michel of, 15.
Champeaux, Guillaume de, 64; how judged by modern historians, 67.
Champollion's researches, 178.
Christ, the sufferings of, 161.
Christendom, symbols of, 228.
Christian emperors, their difficulties, 75.
Church, a Catholic Christian, the want of the time, 491.
Church, the, and the Empire during the fourth century, 70.
Church life, 235.
Church and the world, the, 230.
Cock, the wild, of the Talmud, 265, 269.
Commentary on the Bible, the Speaker's, 159.
Commentary on the Old Testament, 225.
Commission, report of the Ritual, 297; evidence, 301.
Confession to a priest, 323.
Constantinople, the council of, 73.
Contingencies, instances of the recognition of, 425.
Court, inner, of the Temple, 36; of the Gentiles, 38; outer, of the Temple, 35.
Courts of the Temple, 33.
Criticism, a, upon Genesis vi. 1—5, 123.
Daniel, the seventy weeks prophecy in, 210; prophecy of the weeks in, 438.

- Dariuses, the two, 192.
 David, the king of Israel, 229; the life and reign of, 482.
 Davidson, Dr., quoted on the Talmud, 262.
 Divine Government, the, 385.
 Divinity, the, of Christ, 215.
 Doctrines of mediæval teachers, 65.
 Early English Text Society, 2, *note*.
 Early English treatises, 1.
 Earthquakes familiar to Hebrew writers, 46.
 Earthquakes and volcanoes, Scripture notices of, 46.
Ecclesia Dei, 235.
 Edersheim, Dr., quoted on the Talmud, 254.
 Edmund St. of Canterbury, 6.
 English treatises, early, 1.
 Erben's preface to the works of John Huss, 97.
 Essays and discourses, 236.
 Essays, miscellaneous, 481.
 Essays on religion and literature, 230.
 Eternal punishment, evil and, 152; Professor Butler on, 156, *note*.
 Eternity, the, of future punishments, 200.
 Eucharistic doctrine, the, of Holy Scripture, 489.
 Eusebius on John the Presbyter, 107.
 Evangelicism, the philosophy of, 227.
 Evil and eternal punishment, 152.
 Exegesis of difficult texts, 349.
 Explorations in Palestine, 177, 351, 494, 497, 501.
 Faith, an essay in defence of the, 482; the dogmatic, 484; the increase of, 493.
 Forensic imputation, 160; St. Paul and, 169; and the Fathers, 170.
 French oratorians, 470; rules of, 473.
 Fund, Palestine exploration, 494.
 Galatians, the epistle to, 488.
 Gate, the beautiful, 33, 43; tradition of the middle ages concerning, 43; Josephus and the *Mishna* upon, 44; views of various writers upon the subject of, 44, *note*.
 Gate Nicanor, the, 40, 44.
 Gate Shushan, the, 42, 44.
 Gates of the Temple, Josephus quoted on, 39.
 Gaytryge, Dan Jon, Sermon by, 3, 4.
 Gemara and Mishna, 254, 257.
 Gentiles, court of the, 38.
 Giants, the, and the Sons of God, 123.
 Gospels, the apocryphal, 486; the four, 239; the four, in the second century, 488.
 Government, the divine, 385.
 Groot, De, on Basilides, 485.
 Grossteste, bishop, his directions to his clergy, 3.
 Hate, examples of, 18.
 Hebrew Manual, by Böttcher, 221.
 Hebrew writers familiar with earthquakes and volcanoes, 46.
 Hell, a description of, 20, *note*.
 Henry quoted on the sign to Ahaz, 348.
 Hermeneutics, Manual of, 484.
 Heroism, by Horace Field, 227.
 Hillel, the famous saying of, 255.
 Hillier, E. J., on Rev. xiii. 18, 457.
 Holy Child, the, a poem, 483.
 Hood, Paxton, on the vocation of the preacher, 478.
 Human spirit, the disembodied, 490.
 Hurwitz and the story of Bar Juchne, 264.
 Huss, John, 97, 329; his Bohemian works, 97; quoted on the Gospels, 98; his exposition of the Creed, 329; quoted on the communion of saints, 332; on baptism, 334; quoted on the foundation of faith, 330; on the real presence, 331; on the descent into hell, 331.
 Ignatius and Nicodemus, 214.
 Imputation, forensic, 160; St. Paul and, 169.
 Imputed righteousness, Archbishop Whately on, 176.
 Intellect, the immortality of the, 493.
 Invention of the alphabet, 178; of printing, 190.
 Isaiah, commentary on, 484.
 Israel, history of, 476.
 Jerom and Augustine, 63.
 Jerom, St., by Thierry, 59.
 Jerom, St., and forensic imputation, 171.
 Jerusalem, the Talmud of, 252.
 Jesu, the, of the Talmud, 279.
 Job, 213; the book of, a revised translation, 129, 352.
 Joel, a translation of, 493.
 John the Apostle and John the Presbyter one, 116, 119.
 John the Presbyter, 106.
 John, Prester, Abyssinia and, 504.
 Josephus quoted on the gates of the temple, 39.
 Josephus, new translation of, 475.
 Kentish dialect, the, 18, *note*.
 Kirkus's essays, 481.
 Lambeth Library, 247.
 Lamps, pitchers, and trumpets, 478.
 Law, the oral, 251.
 Levi, David, quoted on the oral law, 251.

Liber Librorum, 232.

Liddon on the divinity of Jesus Christ, 215.

Linwood on sundry texts of the New Testament, 23, 285.

Love, Infinite, 490.

Mai, Cardinal, and the Vatican Testament, 246.

Maimonides on the Talmud, 250.

Martyrs, memorials of English, 485.

Masson, Gustave, on recent books by Thierry, Michaud, and De Broglie, 59.

Messiah, the Prince, 428, 483.

Michaud, recent books by, 59; his life of Guillaume de Champeaux, 64.

Millennium, arguments about the, 224.

Milligan, Professor, on John the Presbyter, 106.

Miracles and prophecy, 489.

Mishna, description of the temple from, 41.

Mishna, the compilation of the, 252.

Mishna and Gemara, 254, 257.

Mishna, Wotton's translation, 262, *note*.

Moral evil, predestinarian method of accounting for, 400.

Moriah, Mount, position of, 34.

Moses and Og, story of, 271.

Nebuchadnezzar, the accession of, and the eclipse, 455.

Neri, Philip, 471.

Nicanor, the gate, 40, 44.

Nicodemus, Ignatius and, 214.

Nominalism and realism, the merits of, 68.

Note on the taxing, 77.

Notices, scriptural, of earthquakes and volcanoes, 46.

Og, Moses and, story of, 271.

Oratory of France, the, 470.

Palestine, Explorations in, 177, 351, 494, 497, 501.

Papias on John the Presbyter, 106.

Parker, Franke, on the prophecy of the weeks, 438.

Pascal, 467.

Peace, the kiss of, 491.

Philosophers of the eighteenth century, 65.

Philosophy, the, of evangelicism, 227.

Philosophy and religion, 460.

Piety of the English, 2.

Placidia, the Empress, 64.

Poor, Bishop, some account of, 9.

Port Royal, 465.

Prayer Book, the voice of the, 233.

Prayer of our Lord, 377.

Preachers, Early English, 3.

Preaching and Preachers, 492.

Presbyter, John the, 106; Eusebius on, 107; Papias quoted on, 106.

Prescott, J. E., on the Gate Beautiful, 33.

Principles, general, of divine government, 385.

Printing, the invention of, and the Reformation, 190.

Prophecy, miracles and, 489.

Pulpit Analyst, the, 478.

Punishment, eternal, and evil, 152.

Punishment, everlasting, not everlasting pain, 493.

Punishments, the eternity of future, 200.

Rabbis quoted in the Talmud, 253.

Realism and nominalism, the merits of, 68.

Reason and religion, 236.

Reformation, the, and the invention of printing, 190.

Religion and the Bible, Dean Stanley quoted on, 45.

Remorse of Conscience, the, 15.

Repentance, the path of, 224.

Revelation xiii. 18, 457.

Revelation, the divine, 482.

Rich, Archbishop, some account of, 6.

Rites and ceremonies of the Jews quoted, 251.

Ritualism, 236; objects of, 324; the Report on, 297; the root of, 229.

Ritualists, object of, 302.

Robertson, the Rev. C. H., on the eternity of future punishments, 200.

Robinson quoted on Mount Tabor, 375.

Rodwell, Rev. J. M., a revised translation of Job, 129, 352.

Roman Empire, the decline of the, 59.

Rome, the state of, during the fourth century, 60; Thierry quoted on, 60; arrival of Athanasius in, 61.

Row, the Rev. C. A., on the Report of the Ritual Commission, 297.

Samaritan Pentateuch, the, 336.

Sanctuary, the, 37.

Satan's temptations, 488.

Scholastic philosophy, 64.

Scholasticism, the history of, 68.

Schools, Christian, and scholars, 217.

Schultz, Prof. Hermann, on vicarious suffering, 81.

Science and faith of the Talmud, 282.

Scriptural notices of earthquakes and volcanoes, 46.

Sermons by R. S. C. Chermiside, 485.

Sermons, early English, 3.

Sermons preached in Liverpool, 233.

- Shamir, the, of the Talmud, 267.
 Shushan, the gate, 42, 44.
 Simon the Just, 252.
 Society, Early English Text, 2, *note*.
 Sons of God, the giants and the, 123.
 Sorrows, the Man of, 228.
Speculum, the, of St. Edmund, 6.
 Stanley, Dean, quoted on religion and the Bible, 45; on the theology of the nineteenth century, 80.
 Stars, remoter, in the Church sky, 490.
 Suffering, vicarious, 81.
 Sufferings of Christ, the, 161.
 Symbolism, 322.
 Symbols of Christendom, 228.
 Syro-Egyptian Society, 336.
 Table, the communion, 305.
 Tabor, Mount, 374.
 Talmud, the, 249; methods of writing upon the, 249; date of its compilation, 250; origin of, 250; Maimonides on the, 250; an English Jew's view of, 250; the, of Jerusalem, 252; Rabbis quoted in the, 253; divided into Mishna and Gemara, 254; its structure, 254; its character, 254; its value, 257; Ewald quoted on the, 260, *note*; ceremonial and ritual elements in the, 261; Dr. Davidson quoted on the, 262; quoted and compared with the literature of Buddhism and Hinduism, 263; the story of Bar Juchne, 264; three classes of precepts in the, 264; learning and science of the, 265; stories of the, 265; its teachings, 270; story of Moses and Og, 271; immoralities of, 273; piety of the writers, 274; its angelology, 275; its historical truthfulness, 276; its imitations of the New Testament, 276; the Jesu of the, 279; utility of the, 281; science and faith of the, 282.
 Targum of Esther quoted, 270.
 Taxing, note on the, 77.
 Teachers, early English, 2.
 Temple courts, configuration of the, 33.
 Temple, outer court of the, 35; inner courts of the, 36; description of, from the *Mishna*, 41.
 Testament, the Vatican, 243.
 Texts, exegesis of difficult, 349.
 Texts of New Testament, Linwood on, 23, 285.
 Theodosius, the reign of, 74.
 Theology, the, of the nineteenth century, 80; a plea for, 491.
 Thierry, recent books by, 59; his monograph of Saint Jerom, 59; on the state of Rome, 60; quoted on Augustine, 63.
 Tongue, sins of the, 19.
 Tract 90, and its principles of moral teaching, 301.
 Tracts for the day, 492.
 Transfiguration of Christ, the, by Dr. Brückner, 368.
 Transfiguration, the, when and where did it take place, 371, 373.
 Translation of Job, a revised, 129, 352.
 Transubstantiation, 321.
 Treatises, early English, 1.
 Tristram, H. B., on the natural history of the Bible, 486.
 Unction of the sick, the order for, 491.
 Uniformity, the Act of, 302, 314.
 Valentinian, the reign of, 70.
 Vatican Testament, the, 243; the Papal Government and the, 244; Theodore Bibliander and the, 245; Mr. Scrivener and the, 245; Cardinal Mai and the, 246.
 Vicarious suffering, 81.
Vie de Jésus, par Ernest Renan, 233.
 Virgin, views of the Ritualists on the, 324.
 Volcanic operations, indications of, the flood, 47; Sodom and Gomorrah, 49; Egyptian darkness, 49; passage of the Red Sea, 50; Sinai, 51; the destruction of Dathan and Abiram, 53; the passage of the Jordan, 53; at Jericho, 53, 56; at the crucifixion and resurrection, 54; at Philippi, 55.
 Volcanoes and earthquakes, scriptural notices of, 46.
 Volcanoes familiar to Hebrew writers, 46.
 Weeks in Daniel, prophecy of the, 438.
 Whately on imputed righteousness, 176.
 Wine and water, mingling of, 308.
 Wratishaw, Rev. A. H., on John Huss, 97, 329.
 Zoology of the Talmud, 265.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE.

~~~~~  
No. III.—OCTOBER, 1867.  
~~~~~

EARLY ENGLISH TREATISES.

THE books whose titles are given below^a convey but a faint idea of the huge mass of literature which the writers of mediæval times were continually producing. From what has survived the wear and tear of centuries preceding the Reformation, and the ruthless destruction of that epoch, we must conclude that invaluable stores of religious learning have perished for ever. It is idle to bewail the irrevocable past; it is gone from us for ever; but not without leaving us many precious tokens of its vitality and usefulness. Day by day we are fitting ourselves to judge more impartially of the past than we have heretofore done. After the struggle which culminated in the Reformation, men's minds naturally sprang to the opposite extreme, despising the past and its works. But now our scholars, in most cases laying aside all religious bias, turn their eyes lovingly upon the history and records of their own language,^b and labour unceasingly to bring them to the light of day. It has ever been so. The age

^a 1. *The Ancren Riwele; a Treatise on the Rules and Duties of Monastic Life.* Edited by James Martin, B.D. Camden Society, 1853.

2. *English Prose Treatises of Richard Rolle de Hampole.* Edited by George G. Perry, M.A. Early English Text Society, 1866.

3. *Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt; or, Remorse of Conscience.* Edited by Richard Morris. Early English Text Society, 1866.

4. *Religious Pieces in Prose and Verse.* Edited by George G. Perry, M.A. Early English Text Society, 1867.

^b *S. Marherete*, v.

succeeding is too apt to despise and neglect that which immediately went before, and it is left to future generations to render to the dead their due.^c

The deep piety which, in all periods of our Christian history, has pervaded and influenced the English mind, never lacked those who were able and willing to teach with the pen as well as with the tongue. Sometimes the teacher took the more ambitious stand of the poet, and clothed the truths he was called upon to impart in lofty speech and flowing rhyme. At one time he would choose as his theme the knightly deeds of the founders of our race, or the supernatural exploits of some fabled enchanter; at another time, he would lovingly linger over the life, the labour, the sufferings, and the death of Christian martyrs, and preserve to future ages the thoughts and feelings of his companions as they endeavoured to live like those who through martyrdom had obtained the crown which fadeth not away. Others, in the holy calm and peacefulness of the cloister, would pass their time, and spend their strength in turning into English speech portions greater or less of the Bible, that the

^c We have before now spoken briefly of the Early English Text Society, but this will not prevent us from again calling attention to its claims. It is only by societies of a kindred nature that so much of our early literature has been brought from public and private archives, and placed within our reach. In thus speaking we are not unmindful of the splendid series issued under the auspices of the Master of the Rolls, but it must be borne in mind that printing clubs existed long before this series was contemplated. The Early English Text Society is, we believe, far in advance of any of its kind. Others aimed chiefly at supplying works irrespective of cost; this aims simply to provide texts of extreme accuracy, and in this it has been very successful, but it is now hampered for want of funds. This state of things has been brought about in an unusual manner. Its unpaid editors have worked with such rare industry and good will that funds are not forthcoming to print as fast as texts are edited. What the society has done is surprising. The number of volumes issued annually must have astonished the members of some of the older printing societies; yet now this young society has to complain because the public does not subscribe fast enough to print the editors' work. If this state of things should continue, the society will have to exist longer than it anticipated—it must live until it shall have accomplished its task, and if it can only work slowly, it will perchance happen that many who desire to study our early literature will have to wait for texts till texts will be of no avail. The students of our language increase rapidly; we trust the reading public will encourage this study, and aid it too, by subscribing to the Early English Text Society.

“lewed,” as well as the learned, might read in their own tongue the wonderful works of God. Whichever way we look, we find evidences of learning, and by no means feeble attempts to impart knowledge to the people. Teachers were not few, whether they confined their labours to their own immediate neighbours and friends, like the author of the *Ancren Riwele*, or whether, like the *Hermit of Hampole*, they preached the Gospel to all whom they could find. The parish priest of the middle ages was not such a “dumb dog” as some would have him to be,^d nor did he always deserve the satire levelled against him by the author of *Piers Ploughman*, who says they

“Clothed them in copis to be knowe fro othire,
And made themselves eremites thare eise to have.”

Yet did he not court solitude and practise bodily austerities for their own sakes, but was sometimes found as a travelling preacher, intensely devoted to the work of the instruction of his fellow-creatures.^e

Luckily some few of the sermons of these early preachers have come down to us, so that we are at no loss to form an estimate of the style and matter of the discourses which they delivered. The first of Mr. Perry's *Prose Treatises* is a sermon preached by one Dan Jon Gaytryge, at the command “of our father the bishop, who had directed all those who under him had the cure of souls, openly, in English, upon Sundays to preach and teach them that they have cure of the law and the care to know God Almighty.” Some hundred years before this sermon was written, Bishop Grossteste^f had given very similar directions to his clergy, mentioning the very heads which are touched in this sermon, and bidding them discourse of them to the people every Sunday in *idiomate communi*;^g so that here we have the authorized form which the sermon was expected to take. It commences thus:^h—

^d *Religious Pieces*, etc., pref. v.

^e *Prose Treatises*, etc., pref. xiii.

^f He died A.D. 1253.

^g *Religious Pieces*, etc., pref. v.

^h We have preserved the words of the discourse, but have modernized the spelling, adding, here and there, the meaning of a word which might not at first sight be clear.

“As a great doctor shews in his book, of all the creatures that God made in heaven and in earth, in water and in air, or in aught else, the sovereign cause and the skill why He made them was His own good will and His goodness, through the which goodness as He is all good, He would that some creatures of those that He made were communers of that bliss that evermore lasts. And for that no creature might come to that bliss without knowing of God, as clerks teach, He made skillwise (reasonable) creatures, angel and man, of wit and wisdom to know God Almighty, and through their knowing love Him and serve Him, and so came to that bliss that they were made to. This manner of knowing had our forefathers in the state of innocence that they were made in, and so should we have had if they had not sinned. Not so much as holy souls have now in heaven, but much more than man has now on earth. For our forefathers sinned, says the prophet, and we bear the wickedness of their misdeeds, for the knowing that they had of God Almighty they had it of God’s gift at their beginning without travail or tray (vexation) or passing of time. And all the knowing that we have in this world of Him, is of hearing and of learning and of teaching of others, of the law and the lore that belongs to Holy Church, the which all creatures that love God Almighty ought to know and to cune (understand) and lead their life after, and so come to that bliss that never more blynnnes (ceases). And because many folk now in this world are not well enough learned to know God Almighty, nor love Him nor serve Him as they should do, and as their deeds oft-times openly shew, in great peril to them to life and to soul, and peradventure the default may be in them that have their souls for to keep and them should teach, as prelates and parsons, vicars and priests, that are holden by debt for to learn them—therefore our father the bishop, that God Almighty save, that, as St. Paul says in his epistle, wills that all men be saved and know God Almighty, and namely those underlouts (dependents) that to him belong, has treated and ordained for the common profit, through the counsel of his clergy, that each one that under him has cure of soul [should], openly, in English, upon Sundays, preach and teach them that they have cure of,

the law and the lore to know God Almighty, that principally may be shewed in these six things—in the fourteen points that fall to the truth—in the ten commandments that God has given us—in the seven sacraments that are in Holy Church—in the seven works of mercy unto our even (fellow) Christian—in the seven virtues that each man shall use—and in the seven deadly sins that each man shall refuse. And he bids and commands in all that he may, that all that have cure or keeping under him move their parishioners and their subjects that they hear and learn these six things, and often rehearse them till that they con (know) them, and them teach them their children, if any they have, what time so they are of elde to learn them. And that parsons and vicars and all parish priests, enquire diligently of their subjects in the Lenten time, when they come to shrift, whether they know and understand these six things, and if it be found that they know them not, that they enjoin them upon his behalf and of pain of penance for to learn them. And because that none shall excuse them through unknowledging for to learn them, our holy father the bishop, of his goodness, has ordained and bidden that they be shewed openly and in English among the folk.”

The remainder of the sermon treats of each of the “six things” above mentioned, carefully explaining the “fourteen points that fall to the truth”—the creed—the ten commandments, and the rest. All this it does in such a manner and in such terse English as must have told on the dullest of those who listened.

As a further example, take the author’s remarks on the last article of the creed, “The seventh article is, that right as He died and stey (ascended) into heaven, right so shall He come upon the last day, both for to deme (judge) the quick and the dead, where all the folk that ever was, or is, or shall be, shall soothfastly be shewn, and seen before Him, and each man answer of his own deeds, and be saved or damned whether so he serves, for as His righteousness now is mingled with mercy, so shall it then be without mercy.”ⁱ

ⁱ We refer our readers to *J. S. L.*, July, 1867, for another example of the mediæval sermon. They will there find a discourse on Canticles i. 3, by the Hermit of Hampole.

It would have been a matter of regret if one who did and suffered so much for English liberties as Archbishop Rich—St. Edmund of Canterbury—had passed away without leaving some written record of his thoughts and teaching. For what we know of this remarkable man we are mainly indebted to the learned Dean of Chichester,^j who has written a very graphic account of his career. As this work is of easy reference, we simply name it, and avail ourselves of the words of Mr. Perry.

“This^k was a very popular treatise in its day, and, we believe, the only surviving work of the famous Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury—famous for his asceticism—famous as a teacher of Greek at Oxford, and as having had for his pupils Grosseteste, Robert, and Roger Bacon—famous for his sudden elevation to the Primacy—notably famous for the good stand he made in that office for English liberties—famous also for his retirement from his high post; and famous after death for the popular tumult which forced the Pope to canonize him. . . . At the Monastery of Pontigny in France, the place of his retirement, where the great spirits of Thomas à Becket and Stephen Langton had before him found rest, he wrote, or at any rate finished, his *Speculum*. It is a composition which breathes a fierce asceticism, and is almost Manichean in its hatred of bodily ease. This would insure its popularity in an age which only comprehended religion as a bitter chastiser of the flesh, and hence its early translation into French and English.”^l Without subscribing to Mr. Perry’s somewhat harsh remarks—true, doubtless, in some cases—we proceed to notice briefly this mirror of S. Edmund, which forms the second of the “*Religious Pieces*” in Mr. Perry’s most interesting volume. It is a long discourse upon the words, “*Videte vocationem vestram.*” The writer treats of the usual subjects, or the subjects which were common enough then; endeavouring to instil into men’s minds the necessity there was for certain things to be done and believed, and their opposites—what should not be believed, what should be left undone. The author exhorts his hearers to live

^j *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. iii.

^k *The Speculum of S. Edmund*.

^l *Religious Pieces, etc.*, pref. vii.

perfectly; teaches them what the will of God is, and in what holiness consists. Shews men their shortcomings and imperfections; names the prayers we ought to use; and how we may obtain a knowledge of ourselves. In contemplating the works of God we learn the excellence of man's nature, and that all creatures were made for him. In contemplating Holy Writ we learn which are the deadly sins, what the Christian virtues, the works of mercy, and so on. We also are taught to meditate upon the seven prayers of the Pater Noster, and the necessity of saying it with the heart as well as with the tongue. In our contemplations upon God we are to think of the Manhood of the blessed Redeemer, and of all the events of His holy life from birth to death. And these events are to be considered at various times of the day and night; the Birth and Betrayal before Matins: the Mocking and Resurrection before Prime; the Passion and "Witsondaye" (outpouring of the Spirit) before undern (9 a.m.); the Annunciation and Crucifixion before mid-day; the Death and Ascension before None (the fourth "hour"); the taking down from the cross and the Lord's Supper before Evensong; the Agony and Burial before Compline. God, we learn, reveals Himself to man in two special manners; "one within and one without. Within, He shewed Himself through revelation and through reason. Without, through Holy Writ and his creatures." Reason teaches the eternal existence of God, and that there must be more than one person in the Godhead.

The nature of the soul, its power of thought, the greatness of its Maker, His bounty and mercy, are briefly dwelt upon, and these bring the writer to the conclusion of his discourse,—that if we live after this knowledge, we shall live honourably and lovely. We subjoin the closing paragraph of this *Speculum* of S. Edmund:—

"Now, my dear friend, if thou live after this knowledge, then shalt thou live honourably, and that is the first part of our sermon that I touched at the beginning, and after that shalt thou study to live lovely as to thy fellow-Christian, and unto that shalt thou set wholly thy might to love and for to be loved. Thou shalt love all men in God, that is to say, only in goodness,

and not for their fairness of body, nor for force, nor for any bodily virtue, for they that love in such manner, they love not for God's sake ; and to love man in God is none other thing but for to love him for anything that may not be loved without God, as for goodness, or for righteousness, or for soothfastness. If we do good, then have we no friend but good, nor no enemy but ill, and therefore those that are good shall we love because they are good, and the ill shall we love because they may be good. In this manner love thou nothing but goodness, since thou lovest all things for goodness, and if thou wilt be loved shew thyself lovely. If thou wilt be lovely, receive these three words without forgetting ; Do that which man bids thee or prays thee that is good ; take that which man gives thee and grudge not ; and that which men will say of thee, suffer it meekly, and wrath thee not. If thou livest thus loyally, then livest thou lovely. Dear sister and friend, afterward shalt thou study to live meekly, and to this shalt thou learn that there are two manners of meekness. The one comes of truth, and the other comes of charity. By the first mayest thou have knowing of thyself, for thou mayest not in any manner of this world see thyself what thou art in truth if thou be not meeked (humbled). The other manner of meekness mayest thou have if thou think of the meekness of Jesus Christ ; how that He meeked Himself That never did sin, and such meekness comes cleanly of charity. Now, my dear sister and friend, knowest thou what it is to live honourably, lovely, and meekly, and that is to live perfectly."

Of the remaining prose treatise in this volume, "The Abbey of the Holy Ghost," we must not stay to say much. Its general tenor may be gathered from the opening sentences: "Ah, dear brothers and sisters, I see that many would be in religion but they may not, either for poverty or for dread of their kin, or for bond of marriage, and therefore I make here a book of the religion of the heart, that is, of the abbey of the Holy Ghost, that all those that may not be bodily in religion may be ghostly. Ah, Jesu mercy ! where may this abbey best be founded, and this religion ? Now truly nowhere so well as in a place that is called conscience." And then the writer goes on to say, the maidens who cleanse the place are Righteousness

and Purity; Meekness and Poverty prepare the ground. The abbey is built on the river of Tears; the walls are raised by Obedience and Mercy; Love and Faith are the cement; Patience and Strength raise the pillars. Shrift must make the chapter-house, Prayer the chapel, Contemplation the dormitory, Sadness the infirmary, Devotion the altar, Meditation the store-house. The Holy Ghost is warden and visitor, Charity is the abbess, Wisdom the prioress, Meekness the sub-prioress, Discretion the treasurer, Penance the cook, Temperance the waiter, Soberness the reader, Mercy the almoner, Dread the porteress, Courtesy and Simplicity the receivers of guests. Of the garner it is said: "This holy meditation, that is, the garner that keeps yarely the wheat that is red without and white within, that has the side cloven, of the which men make good bread, that is called Jesus Christ, that without was red with His own blood, and white within through His own meekness and cleanness of life, and had His side cloven with a spear. This is the bread that we receive and eat in the sacrament of the altar." By the envy and malice of the devil four evil damsels,—Envy, Pride, Grumbling, and Evil-thinking, were introduced into this abbey, and did much harm. And the inmates "with great devotion of heart unto Him sang all with a sweet steven, *Veni Creator Spiritus*." And their Visitor came at their request, and drove out the evil damsels, and restored the abbey "better than it was before."

To three devout sisters who had their secluded dwelling at Tarente, in Dorsetshire, we owe the *Ancren Riwe*. It appears that these three ladies, at the time when the work was written, belonged to no particular order of nuns, nor were they under any spiritual superior. They, with their servants and lay sisters, constituted the whole of the house. Afterwards, they were incorporated with the Cistercian order, and the nunnery existed until its suppression soon after Henry VIII. quarrelled with the Pope.

A few words may be said of the reputed author of this work, Bishop Poor. He was successively Dean of Salisbury, Bishop of Chichester, Bishop of Salisbury, and Bishop of Durham. He was born at Tarente, died there, and, though Salisbury claimed

his body, his heart found a grave at the place of his birth. He is said to have been the founder of the religious house at Tarente, but it has been suggested that he may have rebuilt or enlarged the house, and augmented its revenues. Matthew Paris speaks of him in high terms of commendation, and gives a minute account of his death. "Perceiving that the time was at hand when he must leave the world, he assembled the people, and addressed them in a very impressive and edifying discourse, telling them that he felt his death was near. On the morrow, when his illness was increased, he renewed his exhortations to them, and bade them all farewell, asking their forgiveness if he had offended any of them. On the third day he sent for his domestics and retainers, and distributed gifts among them according to their merit, calmly and deliberately settled his worldly affairs, and took leave of his friends, one by one; when, it being the hour of Compline, he joined in the prayers, and, while pronouncing the verse, 'I will both lay me down in peace and sleep,' he fell asleep in the Lord. He was a man of great learning, benevolence, and sanctity, and his whole life agrees well with the lessons of piety and morality so earnestly and affectionately addressed, in this book, to the anchoresses of Tarente."^m

We now proceed to give a brief account of the contents of this book. It is divided into eight parts, and treats of divine service, keeping the heart, reasons for embracing a monastic life, temptations, confession, penance, love, and domestic matters, so that very few subjects relating to the human life are omitted. The information on the state of religion is very valuable. Transubstantiation is of course spoken of as a matter of firm belief. Thus when the sisters were quite dressed they were commanded to sprinkle themselves with holy water, "which ye shall have always with you, and think upon God's flesh and on his blood, which is over the high altar, and fall on your knees toward it."ⁿ And further on, when warning them against incontinence, he says, "And yet ye have with you, night and day, the same blood, and the same blessed body, that came

^m *Vide* pref., xii., *et passim*.

ⁿ In all our quotations we shall avail ourselves of the Editor's translation.

of the maiden and died on the cross, there is only a wall intervening; and every day he cometh forth and sheweth himself to you fleshly and bodily in the mass, shrouded indeed in another substance, under the form of bread." But we deem it unnecessary to quote in support of our statement. Let it suffice that "purgatory, the adoration of Mary, and of the cross and relics, auricular confession, the use of images in religious services, and, except indulgences, which are not mentioned, the other usages and practices of the Church of Rome at the same period, are fully received."° But we propose to leave these doctrines and practices, or only to touch upon them incidentally, and devote a little space to the more common concerns of life, endeavouring to shew what were the good bishop's ideas of the manner of life most conducive to obtaining a reward in heaven. The right use of the senses forms an important and not the least interesting part of the book, and the exhortations to keep these gateways of knowledge of good and evil are often backed up by curious applications of Scripture. Curious certainly even in those days, as curious as some of our modern interpretations will appear to the Biblical student of six hundred years hence. Thus, when speaking of sight, the sisters are exhorted to love their windows as little as possible; to see that they are small, and that the parlour windows be least and narrowest of all, and that they are covered with double cloth. "See," he says, "that your parlour windows be always fast on every side, and likewise well shut; and mind your eyes there, lest your heart escape and go out like David's, and your soul fall sick as soon as it is out." Even in the author's days all were not as he would have them to be, for he goes on to say, "I write more particularly for others, for nothing [here said] applies to you, my dear sisters,

° Pref. xvi. The editor says, "Of saints, we read of the adoration of the Virgin only, but we can hardly doubt that the invocation of other canonized saints was likewise practised." On p. 18 we read, "Ther efter wendeth on to vre Leafdi onlicenesse, & cneoleth mid fif aueg: a last to the other onlicenesses, & to ower relikes cneoleth, other luteth, nomeliche to theo halewen thet ye habbeth to thurh luue iturnd ower weouedes, so much the rather ei is ihalewed." Thus rendered: "Thereafter turn to our lady's image and kneel, saying the 'Ave' five times; lastly, kneel or bow to the other images and to your relics, namely, to the saints to whom you have, through affection, dedicated your altars, so much the more readily if any of them are hallowed."

for ye have not the name, nay, nor shall ye have, through the grace of God, of staring anchorites, nor of enticing looks and manners, which some, at times, alas ! contrary to the nature of their profession, practise ; for against nature it is, and a singularly strange prodigy, that the dead should look out, and among living men of the world, consort with sin." Eve is then instanced as an example of the evil which came of looking. " And it is written of Eve, the mother of us all, that sin first entered into her through her eyesight. Eve looked on the forbidden apple, and saw it fair, and began to take delight in beholding it, and set her desire upon it, and took and ate it, and gave it to her lord." Other Bible narratives are then quoted of the evils which came of looking, and we learn that " for this reason, it was ordained by God in the old law that a pit should always be covered ; and if any pit were uncovered, and a beast fell into it, he that uncovered the pit should make it good. This is a very terrible word to a woman who exposes herself to the view of men. She is represented by the person who uncovers the pit. The pit is her fair face, and her white neck, and her light eye, and her hand, if she stretch it forth in his sight." Not only was it dangerous to the beholder, to the man lest he should fall into the pit and die, but the woman was to dread greatly the doom of him who left the pit uncovered. Nothing short of absolute seclusion from the world, from its pomp and vanities, from all its beautiful sights, and from every means of doing good in the world, could satisfy the author of this book. We reverence him for his goodness, while we disagree with his method of keeping his sisters from the evil that was among men. And if sight were so powerful for evil, speech, that great gift possessed by man alone, was equally so. The anchoress, having ascertained through her maid who desired to speak with her, was to make the sign of the cross carefully on her mouth, ears, and eyes. The difference between Eve and the blessed Virgin is held up as a warning in the one case, as an example in the other. Eve held in Paradise a long talk with the serpent, and told it all the lesson which God had taught her and Adam about the apple ; and so the fiend, through her words, understood her weakness, and found out how to ruin her. Our Lady

St. Mary acted in another manner. She told the angel no tale, but asked him shortly that which she wanted to know. Eve without fear spake with the serpent. Our Lady was afraid of speaking with Gabriel. A more homely illustration of the evils of tattling may be quoted. "Let her," says the bishop, "not have the hen's nature. When the hen has laid, she must needs cackle, and what does she get by it? Straightway comes the chough and robs her of her eggs, and devours all that of which she should have brought forth her live birds."

If idle talking were to be avoided, listening to evil speech was to be shunned as being "poisonous, foul, idle." "And of such speech," saith our Lord, "shall every word be reckoned and account given;" why the one spoke it, and the other listened. The evils of lying, slandering, and backbiting are dwelt upon at length, and a holy zeal is manifested in setting them forth in their worst possible colours. Hear the bishop. "God himself saith that He is Truth; and what is more against truth than is lying and falsehood? *Diabolus mendax est, et pater ejus*. The devil, we are told, is a liar, and the father of lies. She, then, who moveth her tongue in lying, maketh of her tongue a cradle to the devil's child, and rocketh it diligently as nurse." The backbiter "is of serpent's kindred, is the devil's raven of hell;" "heo beoth thes deofles zongmen, and beoth withuten ende in his zong huse." Indeed, no epithet is too vile to apply to the man or woman who practises this hateful sin.

It is not denied that the life required of an anchoress is a painful one, but the reward promised in heaven shall be greater. For the righteous God hath so judged, that the meed of every one shall correspond to the toil and trouble endured here for love of Him; and therefore it is right and proper that anchoresses should have these two special gifts more than others, namely, swiftness and clearness of sight; swiftness, in requital of their being here so confined; clearness of sight, in compensation of their darkening themselves here, and being unwilling either to see or be seen of man. . . . "All who are in heaven see all things in God; but anchoresses, for their blindfolding here, shall there see and understand more clearly the hidden mysteries of God, and His secret counsels."

The treatise on Solitude has pleased us as much as any part of the book. It displays an intimate acquaintance with the Scriptures, marred at times by overdrawn conclusions. As, *e.g.*, when speaking of the Blessed Virgin:—"Our dear Lady, did not she lead a solitary life? She was nowhere abroad, but was shut up fast, for so we find. 'Ingressus angelus ad eam dicit, Ave, Maria, gratia plena, Dominus tecum;' that is, the angel went in to her; she was within then, in solitude, all alone. An angel has seldom appeared to man in a crowd. On the other hand, since it is not anywhere recorded in Holy Scripture that she spoke, except four times, it is a clear proof that she, who thus kept silence, was much alone." The chapter on the efficacy of prayer contains much of the legendary, mingled with much that we hold good and true. Be prayers "ever so rudely fervent, or so coarse, the devil of hell is much afraid of them; they bind and they burn him." We are told how Puppius was in prayer, and how the fiend, who happened to be flying high above him, was bound fast by the saint's prayers, and could not proceed hither nor thither for full ten days; and how the devil Ruffinus, Belial's brother, cried loudly to St. Bartholomew, who was much in prayer, and said, "Incendunt me orationes tuæ." On the other hand, devout prayers soften and appease our Lord, but tears constrain him. Prayers anoint Him with sweet blandishments, but tears goad Him, and never give Him peace nor rest until He grant them all that they ask. Confession, penance, and some other subjects, we pass over, and come to the concluding portion of the book, which treats more particularly of domestic affairs; yet the first thing which meets us here relates to the times of receiving the Holy Communion. This we make no apology for quoting entire:—"Men esteem a thing as less dainty when they have it often, and therefore ye should be, as lay brethren are, partakers of the Holy Communion (i-huseled) only fifteen times a year; at Mid-winter; Candlemas; Twelfth-day; on Sunday half way between that and Easter, or Our Lady's day, if it is near the Sunday, because of its being a holiday; Easter-day; the third Sunday thereafter; Holy Thursday; Whit Sunday; Midsummer day; St. Mary Magdalen's day; the Assumption; the Nativity; St. Michael's day; All Saints' day;

St. Andrew's day."^p The author was anxious not to lay upon the sisters more than they could bear, and at times his humanity seems to get the better of his religion, and he appears inclined to relax a little the rules and customs of the monastic life. Thus:—"Ye shall eat no flesh nor lard except in great sickness; or whosoever is infirm may eat potage without scruple; and accustom yourself to little drink. Nevertheless, dear sisters, your meat and your drink have seemed to me less than I would have it. Fast no day upon bread and water, except ye have leave." And we venture to hope he rarely accorded this "privilege." Again he says,—“Ye shall sleep in a garment and girt. Wear no iron, nor hair-cloth, nor hedgehog-skins; and do not beat yourselves therewith, nor with a scourge of leather, nor leaded; and do not with holly nor with briars cause yourselves to bleed without leave of your confessor; and do not, at one time, use too many flagellations. Let your shoes be thick and warm.” Only one luxury, often deemed dear to the female heart, do we find allowed. But the bishop was a good man, and, where there was no fear of sin, was willing to deal tenderly with the good nuns of Tarente. “Ye shall not possess any beast, my dear sisters, *except only a cat.*”^q

But the most important work in our list is that which we have reserved till last. Dan Michel, a worthy monk of Canterbury, spent his time in translating the French treatise, *Le somme des Vices et de Vertues*, by Frère Lorens (or Laurentius Gallus, as he is designated in Latin). The treatise was composed in the year 1279 for the use of Philip the Second of France,^r and was translated into English some sixty years later. Dan Michel does not inform us that his work was only that of a translator, but there can be no doubt upon this head, as French copies of an earlier date are in existence. Respecting the title of the book we need not say much. It is, as the Editor remarks, “thoroughly English,—*Ayenbite of Inwyt* (the again-biting of the inner wit); or, *The Remorse of Conscience.*” A

^p This is not very clear: the Editor says, by nativity is meant the nativity of B.V.M., 8th September.

^q The date of the *Ancren Riwe* is fixed at about A.D. 1230.

^r Pref. i.

rapid survey is all that we can give, illustrated, here and there, by quotations from the work, so as to give our readers a fair and accurate idea of the style of the translator, and the subject of his treatise.

We need not pause at the opening pages of the book, which are devoted to the Decalogue and the Creed. These are treated in a manner which calls for no special remark, so we at once pass on to the "Shewing that St. John the Gospeller saw," which begins thus: "My lord St. John, in the book of his shewings that is called the Apocalypse, saith that he saw a beast that came out of the sea, wonderfully formed (ydight), and too much dreadful. For the body of the beast was as a leopard, the feet were of a bear, the throat of a lion, and it had seven heads and ten horns, and upon the ten horns ten crowns. And St. John saw that the same evil beast had might of himself to fight with the saints, and to overcome and overmaster them. This beast, so wonderful, and so counterfeited and dreadful, betokeneth the devil that came out of the sea of hell, that is full of all sorrow and all bitterness. The body of the beast, as saith St. John, was like to a leopard, for as the leopard hath divers colours, so hath the devil divers manners of watchings and contest to beguile and to tempt the folk. The feet were like the feet of a bear, for as the bear, which has its strength in its feet, holds strongly, and binds that which he hath under his feet, and that which he hugs, so doth the devil them that he hath embraced and overthrown by sin. The throat was of a lion, for his great cruelty, that all will swallow."

What is betokened by the seven heads is then explained. As might have been imagined, the seven heads are the seven deadly sins, by which the devil draws all the world to himself. For it can scarcely be but that men fall into the throat of some one of the seven heads. And therefore St. John said well that the beast had power over the saints. The first head of the beast is pride, and this is a sin which is very dreadful. It blinds men so that they are beguiled by the devil, whatever their condition in life may be, "but specially great lords, so that they see not, nor know their misdeeds nor their follies; then is it the most perilous of all sicknesses. He is indeed in

great peril in whom all medicine is turned into venom, as do teaching and chastisement to the proud." "Pride is the devil's own daughter." It wars against God, is king of wicked practices,—the lion that swallows all; it destroys all the goodness and the graces that are in man; it turneth alms into sin, virtues into vices; and of good works, whereof man should buy heaven, it maketh him win hell. It was the first sin which assailed our Lord, and was the last to leave Him. For when He had overcome all other evils, then pride assailed Him more strongly than all (Matt. iv. 8—10). Pride is divided into seven boughs, and each bough into three twigs, so that untruth, despite, presumption, ambition, idle bliss, hypocrisy, and wicked dread, receive a full amount of consideration, and are dwelt upon with minuteness and truthfulness. Ingratitude, one of the twigs of untruth, is thus spoken of: "But the foulhood which we speak of here specially that cometh of pride, and is a manner of untruth, is a vice that is called in clergy ingratitude, that is, forgetting of God and His gifts; that men thank Him not as they should do. Forsooth, he is a great villain, and untrue before his lord, that thanks him not for the good he has done, and forgets him, and yields him evil for good, and villany for courtesy. The same villany does man to God when he forgets the gifts which He hath given him."

But we cannot follow the particular sins enumerated under this one head. We are content to accept our author's statements on many things, and to admire some of them for their force and brevity. Such are, "Men hold a man wood (mad), that is out of his wit, in whom skill is miswent:" "arrogance is the strength of the devil, for it keepeth and nourisheth all other sins:" "the fourth twig of the bough, whereby the proud sheweth the pride of his heart, is yelping . . . the yelper is the cuckoo that cannot sing but of himself:" "ambition is the devil's pan of hell, wherein he maketh his fryings." The second head of the beast is envy, and against this sin some very vigorous remarks are made. Envy is death's mother; it is the sin which makes man most like the devil, for the devil hates the good of others, and loves only harm, and so doth the envious. The envious man is like the basilisk, for no greenness

may last before him neither in grass nor in tree. This sin of envy "is so perilous that scarcely may men come to right repentance. It is contrary to the Holy Ghost, that is the source of all good. And God saith in His gospel that who that sinneth against the Holy Ghost shall never have mercy either in this world or in the other."

The mention of this text naturally leads our author to particularize the sins against the Holy Ghost. They are overweening, despair, hardness of heart, impenitence, striving against the Holy Ghost in others, and warring against the truth.*

The following from the discourse on hate, the third head of the beast, may remind us that some of us have seen similar things in our own enlightened days, and may cause us perhaps to doubt whether we have advanced so much as some would have us believe. "The third war that the wrathful man hath is against those who are under him, that is, against his wife and his household. For the man is at times so out of his wits, that he beats and smites wife, and children, and servants, and breaks pots and cups as though he were out of his mind. And so he is." The glutton comes in for a very severe handling; he maketh his god of a sackful of dung, his belly, which he loves more than God, and believeth and serveth. God commands him to fast; the belly saith, Thou shalt not, but shalt eat long and late. God commands that by the morning he shall arise; the belly saith, Thou shalt not, I am very full; it behoveth me to

* We give this paragraph in full, as it fairly displays the peculiarities of the Kentish dialect in 1340; "And pou sselt ywyte | pet per byep zix zennes | pet byep specialliche | ayens pe holy gost. pet is to wytene | ouerwenninge. pet makep to moche sprede | pe merci of oure lhorde | and litel prayzep | his rigtuolnesse. and peruore zenegep moche uolk ine hope. pe oper is | wanhope. pet benimep god | his merci | ase ouerwenninge: his rigtuolnesse. pe pridde is wypstondinge, pet is | hardnesse of herte. huanne man is y-hert | ine his kueadnesse | pet me ne may | him wende | and nagt ne wyle | hym amendi. pe uerpe is | onworphede | of penonce. pet is huanne man | ordaynepe ine his herte | pet he | him ne ssell nagt uorpenche | his zenne. pe vifte is | to werri pe grace | of pe holy gost: ine opren. pe zixte is | to werri zopnesse | be his wytinde | and specialliche | pe zopnesse | of pe cristine beleaue. Alle pise zennes | byep aye pe guodnesse: of pe holy gost. and byep zuo greate | pet onneap | comepe to rigte uorpenchinge. and peruore | byep hy | onneape uoryeue."

sleep. And when he ariseth he beginneth his matins, and his petitions, and his orisons, and saith, "Oh God, what shall we eat to day? where shall I find anything worthy?" After these matins cometh the lands, and he saith, "Oh God, we had good wine yesterday, and good meats." And then he bewaileth his sins and saith, "Alas, I have been nigh dead to-night; too strong was that wine last night. My head acheth. I shall not be at ease, through what I have drunk. Let this sin shame man. For first of all he becometh a tavern-goer, then he playeth at dice, then he selleth his own, then he becometh ribald, whore-monger, and thief, and then men hang him. This is the scot that man often pays." The writer had an intense hatred of the tavern, which he does not scruple to call "that well of sin" and "the school of the devil where his disciples study, and his own chapel where men do his service." Surely gluttony and drunkenness must have been rife, or so much and so many hard things would not have been said, and one would hardly have dared to say that after the feast men "wished they had the neck of a crane and the belly of a cow, that the morsels might remain longer in the throat, and that they might swallow the more." There is much truth even now in the following. "At Church can God His virtues shew and do His miracles; the blind to light, the crooked to right. Yield the wits of the wood (mad); speech to the dumb; hearing to the deaf. But the devil does all on the contrary in the tavern. For when the glutton goes in, he goes in upright; when he comes again he cannot sustain himself. When he goes in he can see and hear, and well understand speech; when he comes out again he hath lost them all, so that he hath neither wit, skill, nor understanding. Such be the miracles that the devil maketh."

The sins of the tongue are many,—idleness, boasting, flattery, seduction, lying, perjury, strife, grudging, opposition, blasphemy. "Now shalt thou know that the evil tongue is the tree that God cursed in His Gospel, because He found nought but leaves, that in Holy Writ mean words. And as it is a hard thing to tell all the leaves of the tree, so is it a hard thing to tell all the sins that come of the tongue." We cannot enumerate these. Suffice it to say, all these sins are lashed with an

unsparing hand, and in such language as all would listen to and understand. All honour to Dan Michel, of Northgate, for the bold stand he made in an age not perhaps more sinful, if less refined, than our own. If we reckon the sins enumerated in this book, we shall see no reason to boast. All the heads of the beast as explained by this mediæval monk flourish among us. The "boughs and twigs" are as numerous and strong as ever they were in his day, and there is quite as much need now as there was five hundred years ago for us to strive to induce our countrymen to forsake their sins.

"For to learn to die"" is the heading of the next part of the work under notice. We would willingly pause over this brief treatise, as it exhibits the religion of the time in one of its most favourable aspects. True, we have the terrors of hell plainly depicted, but if we have, the joys of heaven are also set forth, and the advice here given, though somewhat severe, is, we consider, far from misplaced:—

"Then, if thou wilt know what is good and what is evil, go out of thyself; go out of the world; divide thy soul from thy body by thought, send thy heart into the other world; that is, into heaven, into hell, into purgatory. There thou shalt see what is good and what is evil. In hell thou shalt see more sorrows than men may devise. In purgatory, more torments than man may suffer. In paradise, more bliss than man may desire. Hell shall teach thee how God avenges deadly sin. Purgatory shall shew thee how he cleanseth venial sin. In heaven thou shalt see openly how good deeds and virtues are highly rewarded. . . . Forget thy body once a day. Go into hell living, that thou go not dying. This holy and wise men often do. There thou shalt see all that heart hateth and avoideth: absence of all good, enough of all evil: fire burning, brimstone stinking, tempests braying, foul devils, hunger and thirst which men cannot satisfy; divers pains, weepings, and sorrows more than heart may think, or tongue tell; and all shall last for ever: and therefore is this sorrow well called death without end."" But

* Vor to lyerny sterue.

* We may compare with this the description of hell in a sermon at the end of this book. Prudence asks of Dread, "Whence comest thou? Dread saith,

“loue is more stranger thanne drede,” and so the joys of heaven are set forth even more fully than the pains of hell.

The chapter headed “Of three things needful to the Earth,” contains some curious expressions. The “three things” are—good mould, nourishing moisture, and reasonable heat. Without these things the boughs of virtue will not flourish. As God set in Paradise the tree of life amidst other good trees, so hath He set the tree of life amidst the tree of virtues, that is Jesus Christ, that saith, “He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, he hath life everlasting.” By the virtue of this Tree all other trees flourish and bear fruit. “This tree is to be praised and loved for many things. For the root, for the wood, for the flower, for the smell, for the leaves, for the fruit, and for its fair seed. . . . Of this root speaketh the prophet, and saith that, ‘A yerd ssel guo out of the rote of yesse.’ That word is worth as much as a becliping of love. The wood is his precious flesh, the heart of the tree was his holy soul ine huam wes the precieuse yolk of the wysdome of God.” The seven boughs of the tree of life are the beatitudes, thus rendered into English:—“Yblissed byeþ þe poure of goste | uor þe kyndom of heuene is hyre. Yblissid byeþ þe mylde: uor hi ssolle by lhordes of þe erþe. Yblissed byeþ þo þet hyer wepeþ | uor hi ssolle habbe þet confort of god. Yblissid þo þet habbeþ hunger and þorst of rigt. uor hi ssolle by uolued. Yblissed byeþ þe merciulle | uor hi ssolle uynde merci. Yblessed byeþ þe clene of herte | uor hi ssolle yzi god aperteliche. Yblissed byeþ þe paysible | uor hi ssolle by ycleped godes zones.”

From hell. Prudence saith, And what is hell, and what seest thou in hell? Dread saith, Hell is wide without measure, deep without bottom; full of fire intolerable; full of stench without comparison. There is sorrow and darkness; there is no order; there is groaning without end; there is no hope of good; no lack of evil. Each that is therein hateth himself and all others. There I saw all manner of torments, the least of which is greater than all the pains of this world. There is weeping and grinding of teeth; there men go from cold into great heat of fire, and both unendurable. There all shall be burned with fire, and with worms shall be wasted, and shall not waste. Their worms shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched. No sound shall there be heard but woe, woe. Woe they have, and woe they cry. The devil's tormentors torment, and together they are tormented, and never shall there be any end or rest. Such is hell, and a thousand times worse. And this I saw in hell, and a thousand times worse. This I came to tell you.”

In conclusion, we briefly notice a discourse on the difference between "men and beasts," which closes the volume. There is nothing in the writer's estimation to distinguish between man and beast but understanding. Flies surpass man in swiftness, while a feather plucked from the peacock is fairer than he. Is he proud because he bears the image of God? that image consists in thought and understanding; and man's light consists in purity of thought. Light exists, but we go from it, and sin makes us blind. "By Whom the angel is made, by Him is made the small worm. But the angel is worthy of heaven, the worm of the earth. The same that made, He adorned. If He placed the small worm in heaven, thou wouldest reprove Him. If He would make angels of foul flesh, thou wouldest reprove Him. . . . All men are made of flesh—what are they but worms? And of worms He maketh angels." The book ends with an ascription of praise to Mary:—

" Mayde | and moder mylde.
 Uor loue of thine childe :
 . thet is god an man :
 Me thet am zuo wylde |
 Uram zenne thou me ssylde :
 as ich the bydde can. amen."*

We will only add that we believe a careful perusal of these early authors cannot fail to repay the reader. They throw much light upon our past civil and religious history, and mark the progress which many of our present customs and manners had made so long ago as the thirteenth century. They also shew that substantially the Englishman of that day was such a man as the Englishman one meets now—certain changes in dress, speech, and manners being allowed for. As we said at the beginning, above all they prove that there ever has been, and we trust ever will be, a deep vein of piety pervading our whole race. At times this has made itself known under various guises, and it was needful it should when kings and great ones of the earth had to be rebuked by the obscure layman or humble monk.

J. M. C.

* Written as prose in the volume.

OBSERVATA QUÆDAM IN NONNULLA NOVI TESTAMENTI
LOCA.

[Quum editionem Novi Testamenti ab Alfordio concinnatam haud ita pridem evolverem, cupido me incessit, ut quæ in editione ista manca viderentur esse enotarem, quæ male, mea quidem sententia, disputata corrigerem, et totum fere opus sub examen revocarem. Verum enimvero tantum me laboris vix inchoati tædium invasit, ut consilii quod susceperam me plane pœniteret. Ne tamen opera prorsus pereat, paucula quædam inter legendum nata, lectoris, si quis erit, eruditi iudicio commendo.]

GULIELM. LINWOOD, M.A.

Scripsi mense Martio MDCCCLXV.

Ædis Christi nuper Alumnus.]

MARC. i. 41, 42.

λέγει αὐτῷ, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· Καὶ εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ, εὐθέως ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη.—'Εκαθερίσθη, sicut plura id genus similia, edidit Alfordius, vetustiorum, ut ait, codicum auctoritati obsecutus; rectius facturus, si insolitam scribendi normam sacris scriptoribus obtrudere noluisset. Scilicet haec senioris Græcitatæ videntur, et librariis ætatis suæ vel loci stylum oggerentibus deberi. Neque codices isti inter se consentiunt. Quicquid autem de hoc statuas, quod nondum satis exploratum videtur, hoc saltem affirmare ausim, scriptores illos in libris suis exarandis certam aliquam regulam secutos fuisse, nec fieri posse existimo ut qui in v. 41. καθαρίσθητι scripsisset, idem in sequenti versiculo ἐκαθερίσθη scripturus fuerit. Aut hoc igitur aut illud pro spurio ejiciendum erat. Sic in Ephes. i. 7. τὸ πλοῦτος, mox autem in ejusdem capitis v. 18. ὁ πλοῦτος editur. Similiter ἐρευνᾶν et ἐραυνᾶν, εἶπον et εἶπαν, ἐσθίω et ἔσθω, ἦλθετε et ἦλθατε, εἶχον et εἶχαν, ἔβαλον et ἔβαλαν, sæpe intra paucos versus permutata videas. Quis autem credat scriptores gravissimos tam leves et sibi inconstantes fuisse?

MARC. vi. 20.

ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα

δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν· καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἐποίησεν, καὶ ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουε.—Quum tres codices (inter quos optimæ notæ B et N) ἠπόρει pro ἐποίησεν exhibeant, suspicor verba καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἐποίησεν ad v. 16. esse releganda, ad legendum ibi, ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης πολλὰ ἠπόρει καὶ εἶπε. διηπόρει in eadem re enarranda habet Lucas, cap. ix. 7. ἤκουσε δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης τὰ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πάντα· καὶ διηπόρει, κ.τ.λ. Eadem correctio, ni fallor, facienda videtur in cap. ii. 23. ubi legendum ὁδοιπορεῖν. Nam ὁδὸν ποιεῖν contra usum loquendi dicitur, ex quo ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι in media voce dicendum erat.

LUC. ii. 2.

αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου.—πρώτη variis modis explicatur: sed omnia plusquam incerta. Ubi de chronologicis rationibus tam parum constat, conjectura, donec certius aliquid prolatum fuerit, locum tentare liceat. Legendum suspicor, αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἔτι ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου.

JOH. viii. 44.

ὅταν λαλῇ τὸ ψεῦδος, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ· ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ.—Post ὅταν Middletonus (Doct. Gr. A. in loc.) τις subintelligi vult. Recte, si sententiam; secus, si usum loquendi respicias. Nam τις, nisi fallor, in recto casu ellipsin non patitur. Exempla quæ afferuntur partim videntur esse corrupta, partim sunt ejusmodi, in quibus nominativus e contextu recte suppleri possit. Legendum arbitror, ὃς ἂν λαλῇ τὸ ψεῦδος. ὃς ἂν cum subjunctivo in N. T. frequentatum. Cf. supr. iv. 14. 1 Joh. ii. 5; iii. 17; iv. 15, etc.

ACTOR. i. 18.

Οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκθήσατο χωρίον ἐκ τοῦ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας, καὶ πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησε μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ.—Quum Lucas hoc loco diversa aliquatenus a Matthæo eandem rem capite xxvii. 7, persequente tradat, hinc mirum quantum se torserunt interpretes, ut utriusque narrationem utcunque conciliarent. Quo quidem labore, ut mihi

videtur, supersedendum erat: neque enim illis assentior, quibus necessarium videtur ut omnia quæ sacri scriptores tradiderint ad amussim exæquentur. Nec verendum ne sic sua illis non conservetur auctoritas. Immo nullo magis argumento mihi videtur demonstrari posse, scriptores illos veritatem historicam esse secutos, quam quod eos in rebus majoris momenti consentire, in cæteris interdum inter se discrepare videmus. Nam ita fert rei natura, et idem in omni historia scribenda usu venit. Neque mirum cui videri debet, de Judæ interitu, post aliquot elapsos annos, diversa circumferri: quæ res quomodo acciderit non magni nostra intersit. Vide de discrepantiis in N. T. hic illic obviis Alfordium disserentem Prolegom., vol. i., p. 19. seqq.

ACTOR. XX. 28.

ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος.—Quum optimi codices *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου* exhibeant, mirari subit neminem *τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ* legendum conjecisse. *υἱοῦ* enim propter ultimam vocis *ἰδίου* syllabam facillime excidere potuit. Certissimum autem videtur, in precedentibus *θεοῦ*, non *κυρίου*, veram esse lectionem, nunquam enim *κυρίου ἐκκλησία* dicitur, sed *θεοῦ*. Quod si verum sit, *τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος* ad Christum referri tanquam sub Dei nomine significatum, a scriptorum N. T. usu alienissimum foret. Vid. infra ad Rom. ix. 5. Wakefieldium *αἵματος* “prolem” interpretantem pluribus quam necesse erat refellit Middletonus. *τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ* est in Rom. viii. 32. *ὃς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφέλσατο.*

Fons autem hic erroris notissimus. Nam librariis, quum in scribendi operam magis quam in verborum sensum intenti essent, sæpenumero accidere solebat, ut quod semel ponendum erat, bis scriberent: aut quod bis scribendum erat, semel tantum exararent. Ita, exempli gratia, in Rom. ii. 29, ubi vulgatur, *ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας, ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι*, corrigendum videtur *καὶ περιτομὴ ἢ καρδίας, i. e., ἢ καρδίας (περιτομὴ) περιτομή ἐστι*. Nam *περιτομή*, sicut *Ἰουδαῖος*, prædicatum est. Nec dubitandum quin, ubi sensus id postulet, talia etiam invitis codicibus corrigere oporteat. Alterius generis exempla habes infra Col. i. 6; ibid., ii. 14; 2 Thess. iii. 2.

ΑCTOR. XXI. 5, 6.

προσηυξάμεθα καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι ἀλλήλους ἐπέβημεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.—Alfordium satis mirari nequeo, qui in textum ἀπησπασάμεθα, tanquam codicum auctoritate munitum, admiserit, lectores autem ne verbo quidem certiores fecerit, vocem illam græcam non esse. Monendum autem imprimis, codicem Alexandrinum non ἀπησπασάμεθα, verum ἀπησπάσμεθα habere, quod lectionem plane diversam, sc. ἀπεσπάσμεθα, indicat. Et hæc lectio, si ἀλλήλων pro ἀλλήλους cum anonymo apud Griesbachium correxeris, vel, quod nonneminis forsitan magis arrideat, ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, coll. supr. v. 1, Luc. xxii. 41, fortassis haud temere negligenda erit. Pronomen autem, quum ἀσπάζεσθαι jam in textum inductum esset, casum suum postea verbo accommodasse non mirum videbitur.

ROM. ix. 5.

ὧν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.—Christum a N. T. scriptoribus nomine θεοῦ, nedum τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ appellari, non potest non insolentius videri illi qui consuetudinem illorum in hac re probe perspectam habuerit. Nam θεοῦ quidem nomen nonnisi Patri tribuitur; Christus autem, etiam ubi solus nominatur, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν vel σωτὴρ appellatur. Viderint, qui vulgatum θεὸς defendunt, an idonea causa afferri possit quare a recepto loquendi modo hoc in loco apostolus discesserit. Interim mirandum, neminem, quantum sciam, pro θεὸς legendum conjecisse ὅς. Nam qui OC et ΘC inter se contulerit, quam facile alterum in alterius locum transire potuerit levi opera intelliget. Cf. locum celeberrimum 1 Tim. iii. 16. Similis formula cap. i. 25. τὸν κτίσαντα, ὃς ἐστὶν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Quales titulos non solum de Patre sed etiam de Christo usurpari testis est 2 Petrus iii. 18, ubi dicitur, αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.

Haud sum nescius loca quædam afferri, quae a nonnullis ita explicantur ut lectioni θεὸς in hoc nostro loco favere videantur. In quibus palmarius fortasse est Tit. ii. 13. τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Quæ tamen sententia vereor ut argumentis satis idoneis comprobari possit. Omitto Patrum testimonia, non spernenda illa quidem, sed quæ ad hanc litem dirimendam non sufficiant: nam multis, quibus ætas nostra ad recte de his rebus judicandum instructa est, subsidiis destituti erant. Nec audiendi sunt illi, qui *ἐπιφάνειαν* non nisi de Christo dici posse contendunt: quibus satis respondit Alfordius. Majoris momenti est ut inquiratur, utrum articulus ante *σωτήρος* non repetitus faciat, sicut visum est nonnullis, ut *θεὸς* et *σωτὴρ* necessario de eodem sint intelligenda. Quod quamvis primum intuenti ita esse videri possit, si tamen rem propius inspexeris, et causas propter quas articulus omitti potuerit, accurate expenderis, id non necessario sequi, verum de duobus hunc locum et si qua hujus sunt similia, recte intelligi posse apparebit. De quo, quoniam hæc non in tironum gratiam scribuntur, pluribus disserere supersedeo: quibus rationibus adductus hæc dixerim, eruditi satis perspicient.

2 COR. xi. 16.

εἰ δὲ μή γε, καὶν ὡς ἄφρονα δέξασθέ με.—Insolentior videtur usus particulæ *καὶν* sequente imperativo: ex elliptico loquendi modo explicandus. Loca quæ tanquam similia conferri jubet Alfordius, eo non sunt similia, quod in eorum nullo comparet imperativus. Immo in primo quem affert loco, Marc. v. 28, *καὶν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ ἄψωμαι*, nulla prorsus est ellipsis, *καὶν* enim usurpatur sicut in Matth. xxvi. 35; Marc. xvi. 18 et passim. Elliptice adhibetur in Marc. vi. 56, *ἵνα καὶν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωμαι*. Actor. v. 15, *ἵνα ἐρχομένου Πέτρου καὶν ἡ σκία ἐπισκιάσῃ τινὲς αὐτῶν*. Quibus addi potest 1 Cor. vii. 5, *εἰ μήτι ἂν ἐκ συμφώνου πρὸς καιρόν*, cujus loci eadem est ratio. Hujus autem indiligentiæ, non similia pro similibus venditantis, in margine Alfordiano indicia plus semel observavi. Quod ideo monendum, quia studiosi dum loca indicata exquirunt tempus et operam perdunt, nisi operam dent maximam illi qui subsidia hujusmodi conficienda suscipiunt, ut nihil quod non plane ejusdem sit generis inseratur. Loca quædam enotaram quæ in transcurso consulueram, sed talia exscribere vix operæ pretium videtur.

2 COR. xii. 1.

καυχᾶσθαι δὴ οὐ συμφέρει μοι· ἐλεύσομαι γὰρ εἰς ὀπτασίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις Κυρίου.—Lectio καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, οὐ συμφέρον μὲν ἐλεύσομαι δέ, quam Alfordius literis majusculis, tanquam æqualis cum vulgata auctoritatis, imprimendam curavit, nulla prorsus veritatis specie commendatur. Rectissime se habet vulgata: oratio autem, ut quamplurima apud Paulum, impeditior est atque abrupta. γὰρ usurpatur fere ut in Rom. v. 7, ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν. Sensus: “ergo mihi gloriari non expedit: quanquam enim ea sum enarraturus, de quibus jure gloriari possem, ego tamen non gloriabor: nam ἐδόθη μοι” (v. 7), κ.τ.λ.

EPHES. iv. 29.

πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω, ἀλλ’ εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας, ἵνα δῶ χάριν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.—Frustra sunt, quibus οἰκοδομὴ τῆς χρείας videtur explicari posse. Errorem aliquem subesse puto, ex compendio scripturæ, ex. gr. χρς, fortasse derivatum. Num forte legendum πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χάριτος, i. e., “ad incrementum gratiæ?” Sic bene cohærent sequentia, ἵνα δῶ χάριν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.

PHILIPP. ii. 1.

εἴ τις κοινωνία πνεύματος, εἴ τινα σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί.—εἴ τις σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί edidit Alfordius, Tischendorffii dicto male obsecutus. Nam quod ait ille, “talìa nobis servanda esse, nisi grammatici potius quam editoris partes agere malumus,” hujusmodi est quod sapientiæ quandam speciem habeat, revera tamen sit falsissimum. Immo qui talia servat, eum collatoris magis quam editoris munere fungi dixerim. Nam talia manifesto librariis debentur, nec pro vera lectionis varietate habenda erant. Nemo enim opinor credet monstrum lectionis quale hoc est, ab apostolo proficisci potuisse. Multa enim abrupte dicta et salebrosa apud Paulum invenimus: non grammaticæ autem eum locutum esse, virum græcis literis, ut constat, satis eruditum, vix credo. τις nihil videtur esse nisi pronomen præcedens male repetitum, et e textu ejiciendum erat.

PHILIPP. ii. 6, 7.

ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών.—Falluntur qui verba ἴσα εἶναι θεῷ tanquam de vera Christi cum Deo æqualitate dicta interpretantur. Hoc si voluisset apostolus, non ἴσα εἶναι θεῷ, sed ἴσον εἶναι θεῷ dixisset. Nam ἴσα εἶναι θεῷ (ut ex allatis exemplis patet), nihil aliud significare potest nisi “speciem Dei præ se ferre;” “se tanquam Deum coram hominibus ostentare.” Quod quidem Christus, ut humilis animi exemplo esset, facere non voluit; æqualitatem suam cum Deo deponere nec potuit, nec voluit; ideo a Judæis reprehensus, tanquam ἴσον ἐαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ. Joh. v. 18. Cæterum quo sensu ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγήσασθαι dictum fuerit dubitari potest: nam caremus exemplis satis certis quibus res extra controversiam poni possit. Si “rapinam” intelligas, analogiæ id paullo magis consentaneum videtur. Quod si “rem cupide arripiendam” interpretari malis, non sine fructu legentur quæ congegit Wakefieldius Silv. Crit. cxlii. ccxv.

PHILIPP. iv. 3.

καὶ ἐρωτῶ καὶ σε, σύζυγε γνήσιε, κ.τ.λ.—Fieri non potest ut apostolus hunc in modum aliquem allocutus fuerit quem non antea diserte nominasset. Haud alia mihi loci difficillimi expediendi ratio videtur quam ut in cap. i. 1. σὺν ἐπισκόπῳ pro σὺν ἐπισκόποις legatur. Error ex plurali διακόνοις sequente originem facile traxisse potest. ἐπίσκοπος in singulari legitur 1 Tim. iii. 2. διάκονοι autem bis ibidem in plurali vv. 8. 12. quod non sine causa factum videatur. Nec aliter hujus rei testis pervetus Ignatius in Epistolis, ubi de τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ semper in singulari, de τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ autem et τοῖς διακόνοις fere in plurali loquitur. Vid. ep. ad Magn. 6. 13. ad Philipp. 4. 7. ad Smyrn. 12. Quod autem aiunt, τὸν ἐπίσκοπον in loco nostro ad genus referri, id quidem per se verum esse posset, sed quare non eandem ob causam etiam τὸν διάκονον legimus? Cf. Tit. i. 7. qui locus de singulis ex presbyterorum numero eligendis, qui urbi cuique cum titulo episcopi præessent, videtur intelligendus. Ita et Christus tanquam præfectus ante omnes eximius ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν appellatur, 1 Pet. ii. 25.

COL. i. 6.

καὶ ἔστι καρποφορούμενον καὶ ἀυξανόμενον, καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν. Quum καρποφορεῖσθαι in media voce non alibi in N. T. legatur, mox autem in v. 10. καρποφοροῦντες in activa usurpetur, crediderim aberranti describentis oculo, quum καρποφοροῦν scribendum esset, terminationem proximæ vocis ἀυξανόμενον, quæ vox in optimis codicibus invenitur, fuisse obversatam. Nodum in scirpo quærent, quibus inter καρποφορεῖν et καρποφορεῖσθαι distinguendum videtur.

COL. i. 19.

ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησε πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι.—Locus vitii mihi suspectus. Nam τὸ πλήρωμα sic absolute dictum non habet quo referatur: neque enim τῆς θεότητος, quod cap. ii. 9. additur, huc sensus explendi causa transferre licet. Nec dici potest articulum ante πλήρωμα pronominis αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ θεοῦ ex εὐδόκησε intelligendi) vice fungi. Nam illud in iis tantum locis fieri solet, ubi ambiguitas nulla oriri possit. Vid. Middleton, Doctr. Gr. Art., cap. iii. 1, § 4. Unicum omissionis hujusmodi exemplum quod in N. T. observavi, est in Rom. ii. 17. 18. καυχᾶσαι ἐν θεῷ καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα, sc. αὐτοῦ, quod tamen fortasse correctione eget. Pronomen enim αὐτὸς tam crebro in N. T. repeti solet, ut haud multum mirandum sit, si illud toties iteratum a librario oscitante aliquando omissum fuerit. Suspisor autem in loco nostro πᾶν πλήρωμα, unde optimus evadit sensus, esse corrigendum.

Aliud autem, ni fallor, locum insedit vitium. Nam constructio adeo scabra est et inconcinna, ut maximam corruptelæ suspicionem moveat. Dubitari autem non potest, si locum Eph. ii. 14 seqq. contuleris, quin εἰρηνοποιήσας ad Christum sit referendum. Lenissima mutatione locus restitui posse videtur, si constructio versu parenthetico 19, interrupta continuetur, et legatur, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, sc. τὸν θεόν.

COL. ii. 14.

ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν.—Legendum, ni fallor, χειρόγραφον ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι. Locus ex gemello plane Eph. ii. 15, emendandus. ἐν propter ον precedens exula-

visse videtur. Vulgata explicari nequit. Nam si τοῖς δόγμασι cum χειρόγραφον construas, in grammaticam, si cum ἐξαλείψας, in sententiam peccabis. Obiter moneo supra in v. 13, ubi συνεζωοποίησεν σὺν αὐτῷ vulgatur, pro σὺν αὐτῷ legendum videri ἑαυτῷ. Verba scilicet cum σὺν composita præpositionem cum dativo in N. T. non repetunt; quod eruditos fugisse videtur. Vide Lexica sub vv. συζάω, συγκρίνω, συναποθνήσκω, συνεγείρω, συμβασιλεύω, κ.τ.λ. Pro σὺν ἑαυτῷ codices nonnulli apud Griesbachium ἐν αὐτῷ habent, et unus ipsum ἑαυτῷ. σὺν autem ex σεν in verbo precedenti irrepsisse puto: nam ὑμᾶς, quod post συνεζωοποίησεν in codicibus haud paucis legitur, librario pronominis longius a verbo suo disjuncti oblito deberi crediderim.

Col. ii. 18.

μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, κ.τ.λ. —Memoratu digna Toup̄ii conjectura ad Suidam, vol. i., p. 302. ἐλθὼν pro θέλων rescribentis. ἐλθὼν sic usurpatur Rom. xv. 32; 1 Cor. iv. 21; coll. ii. 3; 2 Cor. ii. 1. θέλων sive cum verbo καταβραβεύετω construas, sive per Hebraismum ad ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ referas, durissimum videtur. Nec dubito quin Toup̄ius verum viderit. Verum enimvero res ab hodiernis N. T. editoribus ita geri videtur, ut quicquid a doctorum virorum conjecturis profectum fuerit, flocci faciant, quasi nihil dignum memoratu sit habendum, quod non sit in manuscriptorum aliquo inventum. Quod tamen est ineptissimum. Nam si e plurimorum codicum lectionibus, diversissimis sæpe illis et sibi contrariis, aliquam demum elegeris, quid istud tandem nisi conjectare est? Et si in profanis scriptoribus tantum lucis in locis innumeris hinc affulsit, quidni et in sacris idem fieri posse speremus?

2 THESS. iii. 2.

καὶ ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων.—ἀτόπων delendum esse suspicor, ex ἀπὸ τῶν præcedenti, quod totidem literis continetur, fortasse repetitum. Et res quidem ἄτοπα recte dixeris: homines non ita. Verbum ῥύεσθαι cum πονηρὸς tantum jungitur Matt. vi. 13, ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. Infra v. 3, φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. 1 Tim. iv. 18,

ῥύσεται με ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ. καὶ autem, postquam ἀτόπων invectum erat, sensus explendi causa additum.

PHILEM. 9.

παρακαλῶ τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης, νυνὶ δὲ καὶ δέσμιος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—Hæc legenti statim suspicio mihi nata est, πρεσβευτῆς pro πρεσβύτης corrigendum esse, recordanti loci simillimi Eph. vi. 20. ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβεύω ἐν ἀλύσει. Quam correctionem, de qua recentiores silent, quum Griesbachii editionem consuluissem, jam et aliis in mentem venisse cognovi. Nec dubito quin πρεσβευτῆς correctio sit certissima. Constructio est: πρεσβευτῆς, νυνὶ δὲ καὶ δέσμιος, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. πρεσβύτης quo sensu παρακαλεῖν dicatur intelligi quidem potest, illud tamen convenientius, et magis ex Pauli persona dictum censeo.



We are indebted to the kindness of their learned author for permission to insert the foregoing observations, a few copies of which have been previously printed for private use. A second similar paper will appear in our next.—ED. J. S. L.

ON THE GATE BEAUTIFUL OF THE TEMPLE.

BY J. E. PRESCOTT, B.D.

THE number of works on the New Testament which issue from the press, both in England and Germany, should certainly suffice for the determination of any point of detail. But it is exactly on such points that little additional light is thrown. In not a few instances successive commentators cling to "the traditions of the ancients;" and further investigation appears to be stayed. Yet no student of the Bible can fail to see how important these minor illustrations are; for, assuredly, the sacred writers penned no vain words.

To judge by the varied opinions expressed, considerable doubt exists with regard to the position of that gate of the Jewish temple which St. Luke tells us was called "Beautiful" (τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὴν λεγομένην Ὠραίαν, Acts iii. 2). This doubt has apparently arisen from a confusion of the several courts of the temple, and from an improper estimate of the descriptions given by Josephus and in the Talmud.* And these are the main, if not the only, sources from which we can derive any definite information on this class of archæological questions. Among other views there are two, each of which has had a strong body of supporters:—(1) the gate was the great *brazen* gate of which mention is so frequently made; (2) it was the gate Shushan which, according to the *Mishnah*, was an eastern entrance into the temple area from the valley of the Kedron. Each party has considered that the opinion of the other was attended by very serious difficulties. We shall be compelled to conclude that, in *both* cases, those difficulties are insuperable.

Before examining the passages which illustrate this subject, it will be necessary to say a few words on the configuration of the temple courts. We are aware that we shall be traversing oft-trodden and much disputed ground. But our time will not be wasted, if we are enabled to realize more clearly the scene of that signal apostolic miracle. The promise of their risen Master to His disciples was then first fulfilled; and the name

* These are found chiefly in Josephus, *Antiq.*, lib. xi., cap. v.; *Bell. Jud.*, lib. v., cap. v., and the *Mishnah*, Tract. *Middoth* (מסכת מידות).

of Jesus of Nazareth was heard in power. The record of the event was not to be lightly passed over. The apostles going up at the hour of prayer, the lame beggar being carried to his accustomed seat, the precise nature of his infirmity, the temple buildings, the porch of Solomon, the beautiful gate, the marvellous cure,—upon each detail the sacred historian has carefully dwelt. We want only the relative position of the localities to make the graphic description complete.

Mount Moriah lay on the eastern side of Jerusalem, divided from Mount Zion on the west by the Tyropœon valley,^b and from Mount Olivet on the east by the valley of the Kedron, which bounded the whole of the city on that side. Upon this eminence was the elevated limestone rock which formed the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite, and where David raised the altar unto the Lord in the time of the pestilence (1 Chron. xxi. 18; 2 Chron. iii. 1). We believe that the great altar of sacrifice in the Jewish temple stood upon this rock, and that over it is now built the mosque of Omar, also called Kubbet-es-Sakharah, or the Dome of the Rock.^c From the base of the hill immense walls were raised, Solomon having commenced those which were built up from the depths of the eastern valley. By filling in with earth where necessary, the whole was brought up to one uniform level. Upon this artificial platform, or terrace, the temple was built. The enclosure was a square, or nearly so,^d about a stadium (606 feet) each way; this was surrounded on the four sides by cloisters built against the outer

^b The debated question as to the direction of the *upper* part of this valley is fairly stated in the *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, art. *Jerusalem*; see also Ritter, *Palestine* (Trans. iv., 106).

^c For the historical associations connected with this rock, see Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, i., 298, sq. (ed. 2); for a description of the mosque and the rock, Williams, *The Holy City*, ii., 301 (ed. 2); Pierotti, *Jerusalem Explored*, i., 85, and plates xxvi., xxvii., and Comte de Vogüé, *Les Églises de la Terre Sainte*, p. 276.

^d Josephus (*Antiq.*, xv., 11, 3), and the *Mishnah* (*Middoth*, ii., § 1), agree on this point, although we should not like to press their measures. Including the fortress of Antonia, Josephus makes the periphery six stadia (*Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 2); he affords a curious corroboration by affirming that the Jews, in demolishing Antonia, fulfilled the oracle, which declared that the city would be taken when the temple should become square (*Bell. Jud.*, vi., 5, 4).

walls. Here then we have the outer court of the temple, called, by Christian writers, the Court of the Gentiles; by Josephus, the Outer Temple; in the Old Testament, the Court of the Lord's House (Jer. xxvi. 2), or the Great Court (2 Chron. iv. 9); but always by the Jewish writers of the Apocrypha and the Talmud, the Mountain of the House (הר הבית). Into this Court almost any one was permitted to enter; and from it Our Lord twice expelled those traffickers who had turned it into a market-place. On the north-western angle of the court abutted the great fortress of Antonia, although its exact extent is yet undetermined. Here Roman troops were quartered, especially during the greater Jewish festivals. The fortress was connected with the temple cloisters by means of flights of stairs, and up these St. Paul was dragged by the soldiers when they had rescued him from the hands of his infuriated countrymen, who thought he had introduced a Gentile into the inner courts (Acts xxi. 30, 34).^e The cloisters, having flat roofs of panelled cedar, were supported by double rows of white marble Corinthian columns, except on the southern side, where was the magnificent Stoa Basilica, or Royal Porch. This was supported by four rows of more lofty columns; and as one row was built into the outer wall, they formed a nave and two lower side aisles, which ran the whole width from the eastern to the western valley. The cloisters on the east side were called the porch of Solomon, no doubt from being built upon a portion of the embankment and wall raised by the Hebrew monarch from the Kedron valley. Those foundations had not been entirely destroyed when the temples of Solomon and Zerubbabel were overthrown; and these cloisters are frequently mentioned by Josephus as being founded upon the work of Solomon.^f He dilates upon the vast stones in the outer wall, carefully jointed and fastened with iron and lead. Probably some of them are what may be seen at the present day.

^e Compare also Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 8. The whole narrative receives striking illustration from a knowledge of the temple:—the expulsion of Paul from the inner courts, and then the hasty shutting of the gates which led thence into the outer court of the Gentiles (ver. 30), the running down from the fortress of the commander with his soldiers and centurions (ver. 32), and the subsequent mention of the fortress and the stairs (vers. 34, 40; chap. xxii. 24).

^f Compare *Antiq.*, xx., 10, 7; also xv., 11, 3; viii. 3, 9; *Bell. Jud.* v., 5, 1.

Within the wide open space or outer court^g stood the inner courts upon a raised platform. Around this more sacred portion was a low (three cubits) marble screen or balustrade, having pillars at intervals upon which were Greek and Latin inscriptions forbidding any but Jews to enter under pain of death. Within the screen a flight of steps led up to the other courts; first fourteen steps, then a level space of ten cubits, called the Chel, and after this five steps more through the gates.^h The eastern portion of this grand platform was occupied by the square Court of the Women, surrounded by a cloister wall, and entered by several gates, of which we shall have to speak below. It was so termed because no women were permitted to pass beyond it into the more sacred portion of the temple. Here it was that Our Lord sat and beheld the widow cast her mites into the treasury (Mark xii. 42; Luke xxi. 1). To the west of the Court of the Women, still further raised, was the Court of Israel, to which the only entrance *from the Court of the Women* was on the eastern side, up fifteen semi-circular steps,ⁱ and through a brazen gate. In the centre of this court, as regards north and south, was a raised platform, two and a half cubits high. Again, in the centre of this platform, as regards north and south, stood the Holy House, the Sanctuary (*ναός*) itself; to its entrance, which looked eastward, there was an ascent of twelve steps; below, in front of the entrance stood the great altar of burnt offerings, while around the sanctuary and the altar was an ornamental stone balustrade, one cubit high, separating them from the Court of Israel, and forming the Court of the Priests.^j The western

^g In the middle, according to Josephus (*Antiq.*, xv., 11, 5), but rather towards the north-west corner, according to Tract. *Middoth* (ii., § 1), one evidently measuring from the cloisters, the other from the outer wall.

^h Except at the great eastern gate, the gate Beautiful, as we shall conclude, where these five became fifteen shallower steps (*Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 3). The Chel, which Josephus only speaks of as a "level" (*πᾶν ἰσόπεδον*), has its name given, with the same dimensions, in Tract. *Middoth* *החל עשר אמות* (ii., § 3). The true height of the terrace on which the inner courts stood appears to have been fifteen cubits (*Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 2), say 22½ English feet.

See Tract. *Middoth*, chap. ii., § 5; Tract. *Succah*, v., § 3.

^j Compare *Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 6; *Antiq.*, xv., 11, 5. Some writers, as Williams and others, put the Court of the Priests to the west, and not in the midst of the Court of Israel. But it was evidently surrounded by the Court of Israel; this

wall of the sanctuary came to the edge of the Court of the Priests.^k To the north of the altar were all the arrangements for that strange sacrificial system of worship,—the rows of rings at which the victims were slaughtered, the hooks on which they were hung to be flayed, and the marble tables on which the entrails were washed and the offerings prepared.

We may add that the Holy House, or Sanctuary, consisted of three parts. Its first entrance, *which looked eastward*, had no doors, and led into the vestibule, or *προνάϊος*, where everything was covered with gold; a double gate led hence into the Holy Place; and over this *inner* doorway was the famous golden vine “whose clusters of grapes hung down a man’s stature in length.” In front of this double gate was suspended a richly-embroidered Babylonian veil. Passing within the Holy Place, everything was gilt over or of gold, and here were deposited the seven-branched candlestick, the table of shewbread, and the altar of incense. A second veil (Heb. ix. 3) hung before the entrance to the Holy of Holies, which was entirely empty; this veil was rent in twain at the crucifixion. The front of the Sanctuary, one hundred cubits in width, was overlaid with plates of gold; and the whole pile of buildings, of white stone and gold, raised on the high platforms, looked from a distance, as Josephus says, “like a mountain covered with snow.”

Having thus obtained a bare outline of the courts of the temple, we proceed to consider first the entrances which led

is shewn by the encircling barrier mentioned in the text, and by the additional entrance gates for the people into that court, three to the north and three to the south (*Antiq.*, xv., 11, 7; *Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 2); in fact, there seem to have been single cloisters affording shelter to the worshippers all round the outer wall of this court and that of the women; compare *Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 2, last part, and Lightfoot, *Descrip. Templi*, c. xxxiii., with his quotation from Tract. *Pesachin*. Moreover, taking the dimensions of the Court of Israel in *Middoth* (v., § 1, and ii., § 6), we have, measuring from the east gate, (1) width of court of Israel, from wall to court of priests, 11 cubits; (2) similar width of court of priests, 11 cubits; (3) length of altar, 32 cubits; (4) between porch of sanctuary and altar, 22 cubits; (5) length of sanctuary, 100 cubits. The total is 176 cubits; but the whole length of the court of Israel is given as 187 cubits. Hence the difference is 11 cubits; just what should be the width of the court of Israel, measuring from the *western* wall of the inner enclosure to the wall of the court of the priests *and* of the sanctuary.

^k See the conclusion of the preceding note.

from the Court of the Gentiles to the inner and more sacred enclosure. The outer wall of this enclosure, as we have seen, surrounded the two Courts of the Women and of Israel, lying side by side, the former to the east, the latter to the west. From the description of the temple given by Josephus in his *History of the Jewish War* (v. 5, § 2), we learn that four gates on the north and four on the south led into this enclosure ; that there were also two other gates looking towards the east, one in the eastern wall of the enclosure, another exactly opposite to it in the wall which separated the Court of the Women from the Court of Israel.¹ He goes on to say, that of these four northern and four southern gates belonging to the inner enclosure, one on the north and one on the south led into the Court of the Women. "The quarter toward the west had no gate ; the wall on that side (of the enclosure) being built without a break." In the next section (§ 3) he describes the ten gates which he has just mentioned, and appears to take his stand as it were at the door of the sanctuary. *Nine* of them were overlaid throughout with gold and silver ; but one, that which was exterior to the sanctuary (ἡ ἔξωθεν τοῦ νεῶ), viz., the one between the Court of Israel and the Court of the Women, was of Corinthian brass,^m and greatly exceeded in value (πολὴ τῇ τιμῇ ὑπεράγουσα) those plated with silver and gold. Hence this gate, called generally the Brazen Gate, and, in the Talmud, the Gate of Nicanor, or Great Door, is identified by a very large number of writers with the Gate Beautiful mentioned by St. Luke, notwithstanding the difficulties they acknowledge, viz., that the cripple would not be laid where, comparatively, so few entered of whom he might ask alms, and the very great doubt whether he would have been admitted so far within the more sacred precincts." But another gate Josephus has left to

¹ In *Antiq.*, xv., 11, 5, he speaks of three to the north and three to the south, but evidently is not reckoning the three on the north, south, and west, belonging especially to the Court of the Women.

^m More correctly "bronze," rather than "brass;" on its great value, but little inferior to gold, see Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, lib. xxxiv., caps. i., iii., and the reff. in Facciolati's *Lexicon*, s. v. *Corinthius*.

ⁿ See Josephus, *Cont. Apion.*, ii. 8. The instances cited by Wetstein, from the Talmud, of lepers at the gate of Nicanor are very doubtful; lepers were distinctly not allowed in the city; compare *Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 6.

describe more fully. To proceed with his account:—after stating the measures and construction of the gateways, he adds, “And of the other (gates) the dimensions were equal, but that beyond the Corinthian (brazen gate), opening eastward from the Court of the Women, right over against the gate of the sanctuary, was much greater, for its height being fifty cubits it had doors of forty (others only thirty) cubits, and decorations much more costly, to a profuse thickness both of silver and gold.”^o In this section (§ 3) then he describes first the *composition* of the ten gates which belonged to the inner enclosure. All were plated with silver and gold except one, which was of Corinthian brass, and led from the Court of the Women to the Court of Israel. He then speaks of their *magnitude*. All were alike except one, which was larger and far more richly decorated. This larger and splendid gate, let us then remember, was the gate leading out eastward from the Court of the Women into the Court of the Gentiles, exactly opposite to the eastern cloisters or porch of Solomon. Any one entering this gate westward, *from* the Court of the Gentiles, would find himself in front of the brazen gate of Nicanor, on the other side of the Court of the Women; and when he had crossed and passed through that gate he would stand before the gate of the Holy House, as stated by Josephus above. This large eastern gate, therefore, and not the interior Gate of Nicanor, we must believe to have been the Gate Beautiful of St. Luke. Everything agrees with the narrative of the healing of the cripple who was daily laid at this gate to beg of the passing crowd. The vast majority of the Jewish worshippers of both sexes entered by this gate, rather than by one of the *side* gates of the inner enclosure, and thus advanced directly up towards the splendid front of the sanctuary, the sacred buildings rising higher and higher in front of them. From all these worshippers, including more especially the women, the cripple could ask alms, as well as from the mixed throng in the Court of the Gentiles;

^o Καὶ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ἴσον ἦν τὸ μέγεθος ἡ δὲ ὑπὲρ τὴν Κορινθίαν ἀπὸ τῆς γυναικωνίτιδος ἐξ ἀνατολῆς ἀνοιγομένη τῆς τοῦ ναοῦ πύλης ἀντικρὺ, πολὺ μείζων· πεντήκοντα γὰρ πηχῶν ὄυσαν τὴν ἀνάστασιν τεσσαράκοντα πήχεις τὰς θύρας εἶχε, καὶ τὸν κόσμον πολυτελέστερον, ἐπὶ δαψιλὲς πάχος ἀργύρου τε καὶ χρυσοῦ (*Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 3, ed. Dindorf).

there the dealings with the vendors of the animals for sacrifice, and with the changers of the current money into the sacred half shekel, would supply many a small coin for the indigent. Moreover, placed here at the very edge of the more sacred precincts, the cripple would break no regulations as to the admittance of the unclean. It is not improbable that after his cure he entered with Peter and John into the inner courts to praise God; as they came out again by the Gate Beautiful, just opposite to them was Solomon's porch, where, we are told (verse 11), "all the people ran together unto them greatly wondering." In any case, between the porch, or eastern cloisters, and this gate, was the very place where the largest number of people would always congregate.

Two other passages of Josephus are usually cited indiscriminately^p as containing further reference to the brazen gate of Nicanor. One of them undoubtedly does so. In the *Jewish War* (vi., 5, 3), he says: "Moreover the eastern gate of the inner court (*i.e.* the Court of Israel), which was of brass, and extremely heavy, and was with difficulty shut at evening by twenty men . . . was observed about the sixth hour of the night to be opened of its own accord. . . . This also appeared to the unlearned a very happy prodigy, as if God did thereby open to them the gate of blessings."^q But in the other passage, taken from the *Antiquities of the Jews* (xv., 11, 5) there is certainly no reference whatever to the brazen or *inner* eastern gate. Speaking of the inner enclosure, which foreigners were not permitted to enter, he says: "but towards the sun rising there was one large gate, through which such as were pure came in, together with their wives, but further within than this (court) the temple was forbidden to women."^r This is evidently not the

^p As by Conybeare and Howson (*St. Paul*), vol. ii., p. 256 n.

^q Ἡ δὲ ἀνατολικὴ πύλη τοῦ ἐνδοτέρου, χαλκὴ μὲν οὖσα καὶ στιβαρωτάτῃ, κλειομένη δὲ περὶ δειλὴν μόλις ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν εἴκοσι . . . ὥφθη κατὰ νυκτὸς ὥραν ἕκτην αὐτομάτως ἡνεωγμένη . . . πάλιν τοῦτο τοῖς μὲν ἰδιώταις κάλλιστον ἐδόκει τέρας· ἀνοῖξαι γὰρ τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῖς τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν πύλην (*Bell. Jud.*, vi., 5, 3).

^r Κατὰ δὲ ἡλίου βολᾶς ἓνα τὸν μέγαν, δι' οὗ παρῆειμεν ἄγνοι μετὰ γυναικῶν. Ἐσωτέρῳ δὲ κακείνου γυναιξὶν ἄβατον ἦν τὸ ἱερόν. Ἐκείνου δ' ἐνδοτέρῳ τρίτον δπου τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν εἰσελθεῖν ἐξὸν ἦν μόνοις (*Antiq.*, xv., 11, 5). Compare also *Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 2; v., 5, 6; *Cont. Apion.*, ii., 8.

brazen gate, but the *large* eastern gate of the Court of the Women which is mentioned in the *second* part of the description of the gates in the *Jewish War*, and which we have identified with the Gate Beautiful. And the position, as defined here, agrees exactly with the deductions which we have made above. There is also a plain reference to this outer eastern gate again in the next section but one (*Antiq.*, xv., 11, 7).

The confusion then has evidently arisen from not observing that in the account of the gates of the inner enclosure cited above (*Bell. Jud.*, v., 5, 3), as well as in other parts of his writings, Josephus speaks of *two* eastern gates. The *inner* eastern or brazen gate of Nicanor, being distinguished first in the section as being of great value, is at once assumed to be the Gate Beautiful, without considering what is mentioned further on, that the *outer* eastern gate was larger, and probably more beautiful, especially in its decorations. Then *all* the other passages are forced into reference with the particular gate which has been adopted. It was but natural that the two eastern gates through which, rather than through the side gates, the worshippers advanced up the successive terraces of the inner temple, should excel the others in richness, and differ from them in the character of the steps by which they were approached.

Let us now see how far the very meagre description of the temple given in the *Mishnah* supports the conclusion to which we have come. But we should premise that the statements of the rabbis must be taken with extreme caution. For, in the first place, they were written long after the destruction of the temple, by those who had never seen it; and in many cases they are contrary not only to Josephus, but to every probability arising from historical and archæological considerations. In the tract *Middoth* or Measures (cap. i., § 4) it is stated, that there were seven gates leading into the Court of Israel, three in the north, three in the south, and one in the east; and that this eastern gate was called the Gate of Nicanor. And in the next chapter (cap. ii., § 3) we read, that all the gates of the inner enclosure were changed so as to be of gold, except the Gate of Nicanor, on account of a miracle connected with it, or, as others say, because, being made of brass, it shone like

gold.³ In a subsequent section (§ 6) the gate Nicanor is again mentioned as being on the east;⁴ and the position of the *outer* eastern gate is also clearly defined in other of the Talmudic tracts.⁵

In the *Mishnah*, then, we find nothing opposed to the above conclusions; for we learn that the eastern gate of the Court of Israel was of brass, as Josephus affirms, also that it was called the Gate of Nicanor; but there is not the slightest hint which will help to bring it into identity with the Gate Beautiful.

The Gate Shushan has also a considerable number of supporters. It is stated in the *Mishnah* (*Middoth*, i., § 3) to have been in the eastern wall of the outer court, or Mountain of the House, and to have received its name from the representation upon it of the Persian city of Shusha. It would thus form an entrance from the valley of the Kedron directly into the eastern cloisters or porch of Solomon. Even granting its existence and position, there is nothing whatever that would lead us to conclude that it was the gate mentioned in St. Luke's narrative, except its propinquity to the porch of Solomon. It is never spoken of as being remarkable for the beauty either of its construction or its ornaments; a beauty indeed which we should hardly expect in an outer gate, not only of the temple area, but of the city. In fact, the Talmudic account would rather lead us to suppose that the contrary was the case. In somewhat confused terms it speaks⁶ of the lowness of the wall at this point and of the gate, in order that the priest who sacrificed the red heifer (Numb. xix. 4) might see over to the door of the sanctuary as he stood on the Mount of Olives and sprinkled the blood. Moreover, it is in the highest degree improbable that

כל השערים שהיו שם נשתנו להיות
של זהב חוץ משער נקנור מפני שנעשה
בהן גם ויש אומרים מפני שנחשתו
מצהיב:—*Middoth*, ii., § 3.

³ But the account of the gates given in that section by Rabbi Josi Ben Chanan must not be trusted; it is full of inaccuracies and contradictions. Further reference is made to the gate in Tract. *Shekalim*, vi., § 3, *Yoma*, iii., § 10, and *Sotah* i., § 5.

⁴ See Tract. *Taanith*, ii., § 5, and *Succah*, v., § 4.

⁵ Tract. *Middoth*, ii., § 4, and i., § 3; see also Lightfoot, *Descrip. Templi*, cap. iii.

the place habitually selected for laying the cripple should be at a gate leading in only from the country, where he would be able to ask alms of a very small proportion of the worshippers.

But the very existence of this gate is a matter of great doubt. Josephus, in his detailed account of the gates, never mentions it; while his description of the eastern wall rising from the depths of the Kedron valley almost precludes the possibility of any outer entrance into the porch of Solomon. It is very unlikely that any of the outer gates of the city should ever have led into the sacred precincts themselves. Indeed we learn from the narratives of the siege of Jerusalem that this eastern temple wall, with its rocky foundations, was a most efficient fortification of the city on that side.¹⁰ The whole account of the gates given in the *Mishnah* is sadly incorrect. Symmetry appears to have been the main object of the rabbinic writers. For instance, they make (*Middoth*, cap. i., § 3) only one gate into the temple area on the west, while Josephus speaks of four; a statement which has been most fully borne out by modern archæological investigations.

There may have been an eastern city gate to the north of the Court of the Gentiles; and this—although we much doubt it—may have been in the position of the gate of Roman origin, now called the Golden Gate, but which is certainly too far north to have been an opening into the eastern cloisters, and evidently can never have been intended as a defence.¹¹ It should be observed, too, that this gate has been long walled up, probably since before the time of the Crusades; the reason given by the Mohammadans being that it was closed *for the security of the sanctuary*. A story of somewhat doubtful parentage asserts that a monarch will enter by it to take the city, and become lord of the whole earth.

We need not stay to discuss the tradition of the middle ages¹² which placed the Gate Beautiful, *Porta Speciosa*, as a

¹⁰ Compare also Tacitus, *Hist.*, v., 11.

¹¹ See Fergusson, *Holy Sepulchre*, p. 28, and *Essay*, p. 99; also for an account and drawings of the gate.

¹² William of Tyre, *Hist.*, lib. viii., c. 3; and see the reff. in Tobler, *Jerusalem*, i., 500, 537.

western entrance to the temple,—a tradition which still clings to one of the modern gates of the Haram area; neither need we follow those who have attempted to trace the word *Ἰσπαλαῦ* up through some fanciful derivation to a gate which was not.

We see, then, that the accounts of Josephus and of the *Mishnah* alike support our conclusion concerning the Gate Beautiful. Both determine the positions of the *eastern* gates of the inner enclosure; and, especially, both affirm the Gate of Nicanor to have been made of brass, so called, and to have occupied the eastern entrance into the Court of Israel. This latter fact is overlooked by the very many writers who have wished to adapt this gate to the probabilities of the case, and who, without compunction, have moved it bodily further to the east.

We have shewn that the Gate Shushan, even if it existed as a gate of the temple at all, has no claim whatever, either from its character or position, to be considered the Gate Beautiful. Indeed, the identity would never have been guessed at had it not been for the great difficulties which beset the claims of the Gate of Nicanor.

We have also shewn that there are reasons which would render it impossible in any case to identify the brazen gate of Nicanor with the gate mentioned in St. Luke's narrative, and that commentators have come to that conclusion because they have been led away by the *first part* of the description of the gates given by Josephus, which seemed at the moment sufficient to satisfy their wants.*

* It may not be uninteresting to give a statement of the views supported by some of the principal more modern writers who have touched on the subject. If we represent by (α) the identification with the Gate Shushan; by (β) that with the brazen gate in the position ascribed to it by Josephus and in the *Mishnah*; by (γ) that with the brazen gate, but placed according to the fancy of the writer in some position which it did *not* occupy, we find:—Alford (*Gr. Test.* and *N. T. for English Readers*), states α and β, leaves it uncertain.—Bengel (*Gnomon*) supports α.—Conybeare and Howson (*St. Paul*), α.—Cook (*Comment. Acts*), β, but prefers α, making Shushan of *brass*, and with wrong reff.—*Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, α.—*Dict. of the Bible* (Fergusson), β, but is confused.—Fergusson (*Holy Sepulchre*, 1865; *Essay*, Plan), γ.—Hackett (*Comment. Acts*), γ.—Hammond (*Annot.*), α.—Horne (*Introduction*), β.—Humphry (*Comment. Acts.*), β.—Jahn (*Antiq.*), γ.—Kuinöl (*Comment.*), states β, prefers α.—Lange (*Bibelwerk*), β.

And we have pointed out that in the *latter part* of that description a gate is markedly mentioned which fulfils every requisite, and was, there can be little doubt, the Gate Beautiful of the temple of Herod, viz., the large and splendid eastern gate, beautifully ornamented and covered with massive plates of silver and gold, which led up from the Court of the Gentiles into the Court of the Women.

—L'Empereur (Notes to the *Mishnah*), γ.—Lewin (*Siege of Jerusalem*), γ.—Lightfoot (*Descrip. Templi*), γ.—Meyer (*Comment.*), γ.—Milman (*Hist. of Jews*), β.—Olshausen (*Komment.*), γ.—Webster and Wilkinson (*Gr. Test.*), γ.—Wetstein (*Gr. Test.*), β.—De Wette (*Archäologie*), α; (*Handbuch zum N. T.*), α, but doubtfully.—Whitby (*Comment.*), γ.—Williams (*Holy City*, vol. i.), β; (vol. ii.), α.—Winer (*Realwörterbuch*), α.—Wordsworth (*Gr. Test.*), α or β. Lightfoot and L'Empereur come nearest to the fact; they place the gate in the right position, but cannot resist identifying it with the brazen gate of Josephus. None of the above writers apply the passage we have cited to the proper large and *plated* outer eastern gate of the inner enclosure.

As regards religion, properly so called, the Bible has done its blessed work in all ages, even when in the hands of but a few, by keeping alive directly and indirectly the substantial truths of the Jewish and Christian dispensations. There have, of course, been always some who have studied it as faithfully as their knowledge permitted; but these, as far as theology was concerned, are the exceptions. What was done by Origen, by Theodore of Mompuesta, by Chrysostom, by Jerome, by Erasmus, by Calvin, by Grotius, by Richard Simon, and by other like laborious scholars, was excellent as far as it went in this direction; but it was again and again set aside by the main current of their times. Even at the Reformation, it was not so much the contents of the Bible, as the right of reading it, which gave the stimulus to human thought. It was, speaking generally, from the time when the Germans began to interpret the Bible with the same freedom from party feeling, the same single-minded love of truth, the same fearlessness of consequences,—it must be unfortunately added, in some instances, with the same arbitrary and supercilious dogmatism as that which they employed on other books; it was from that moment that the Bible attracted theologians towards itself, not for the sake of making systems out of it, but for the sake of discovering what it actually contained.—*Dean Stanley.*

SCRIPTURAL NOTICES OF VOLCANOES AND EARTHQUAKES.

THE volcano and the earthquake are such marvellous and striking phenomena, that they have ever arrested a large share of the attention of mankind. The terror, which they at first inspire, gives place ere long to wonder and curiosity.

The earliest notices of phenomena of this nature are to be found in the oldest of human records—the Bible. In drawing examples from this source, however, it must be borne in mind that the Hebrew writers were in the habit of referring all extraordinary natural phenomena to the direct and immediate agency of the Deity. “He looketh on the earth, and it trembleth; He toucheth the hills, and they smoke.” Such is their mode of expression in allusion to the earthquake and the volcano. Hence, in some of their descriptions, there is, to those accustomed to a different train of thought, a tinge of the miraculous beyond what the writers themselves may have intended to convey. Events, which we should regard simply as resulting from the operation of those wise and beautiful laws by which God governs the physical universe, or, in popular language, as dispensations of Divine Providence, the Hebrews seem to have viewed as isolated acts of immediate divine volition, and independent of all law. This, however, is a less objectionable practice than that of some modern writers, who, having personified nature as a female, speak of her ways and doings with a familiarity and irreverence that shock the religious mind. They seem to forget that all natural occurrences are the result of divinely appointed laws, which are the best adapted to subserve the divine purposes, although we may not always be able to discover what is the end which the Supreme Ruler has in view.

That both the earthquake and the volcano were familiar to the minds of the Hebrew writers, several passages of Scripture testify; see, in particular, those under noted.^a It is remarkable, however, that mere allusions to these phenomena greatly

^a Nahum i. 5, 6; Micah i. 3, 4; Isaiah lxiv. 1, 3; Jer. li. 25, 26; Psalm xviii. 7, 8; xli. 2; lxxvii. 18.

predominate over any direct notices of their actual exhibition. The earliest hint of anything like volcanic agency occurs in Gen. iii. 24. It has been suggested by a German writer (Sickler), that the "flaming sword which turned every way" may be a poetical description of volcanic fires, which were the means employed to drive Adam and Eve from the garden of Eden and prevent their return. If the passage is to receive a physical interpretation at all, there seems nothing improbable in this explanation. The popular idea, that the cherubim were angelic beings who held in their hands flaming swords which turned every way, is not warranted by the Hebrew text. The flame is a distinct thing from the cherubim (whatever these may have been), and it is so connected with the verb as to indicate its having been placed, in addition to the cherubim, as a barrier to prevent access to the garden. Literally translated, the passage runs thus: "And he placed from the east, towards the garden of Eden, the cherubim, and also a flame, the sword turning itself to keep the way of the tree of life" (וַיִּשָּׂן מִקֶּדֶם לְגִרְעֵהוּ)

אֶת-הַכְּרֻבִּים וְאֵת לָהֵט הַחֶרֶב הַמִּתְהַפֶּכֶת לְשָׂמֹר אֶת-דֶּרֶךְ : (עֵץ הַחַיִּים). The sword is thus evidently that of the flame, being so called from the resemblance between a long pointed flame and a sword. Now, if there were flames at all, they most probably issued from the earth, and were therefore of a volcanic nature. Nor is there any just reason against our supposing volcanic agency to have been employed to prevent the garden from being any longer habitable by man.

It is very doubtful, however, whether the passage in question was intended to have a physical interpretation. "The tree of life" is so metaphysical an expression, as to raise a probability that the whole language employed in this remarkable narrative ought to be understood as conveying a hidden metaphysical meaning under the cover of phrases borrowed from objects of sense.

The next indication to be found in Scripture of volcanic operations is less doubtful. It occurs in Gen. vii. 11, where, in describing the commencement of the great flood in the days of Noah, it is said, "The same day were all the fountains of the

great deep broken up." It is now a generally received opinion among philosophers, that this deluge was confined to a large area, of which the Caucasian mountains were about the centre. The expression, "all the high hills under the whole heaven were covered," is to be taken in a qualified sense, as having reference to the visible horizon viewed from the ark.

To understand how this might be, it is needful to bear in mind that careful experiments on the specific gravity of the earth indicate its being not continuously solid, but extensively cavernous in structure; so that there are great hollows in its interior. Now it is supposed that, in the days of Noah, a very large tract of country sank into one of those immense hollows, and displaced a vast quantity of water, which had found a lodgment there. That in this manner the whole of that region and the mountains upon it became for a time covered with water. That subsequently, however, the volcanic forces, imprisoned underneath this tract, began to operate, and gradually raised it up again, perhaps even to a higher level than that at which it originally stood. Traces of similar depressions and elevations of large tracts of country have been found in other quarters of the world, and our own island appears to have undergone a similar operation more than once.

That the great flood in the days of Noah was in part caused by volcanic agency is rendered probable, not only by the expression contained in the description above quoted, but also by the fact that Mount Ararat itself, and a vast extent of country around it, bear distinct evidences of volcanic action. Mount Ararat presents the appearance of having been rent asunder from top to bottom; and this being an accident which has happened to more than one mountain, through the agency of volcanic forces, it seems probable that such may have been the origin of this remarkable cleft. Rocks of igneous origin abound in the whole of the Caucasian range of mountains. So lately as the year 1814 an island was raised by a volcanic eruption in the sea of Azof; and in the chain of Elburs, which bounds the Caspian Sea on the south, there is a volcano called Demavend, which has been active in historic times. Earthquakes have also been frequent in the neighbourhood of this mountain, and indeed

throughout a great part of Persia, Georgia, Asia Minor, and Syria; thus shewing that all these countries rest on a volcanic basis.

That the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was caused by a volcanic eruption there seems no reason to doubt. The plain on which those cities stood was remarkable, even before that awful event, for its bituminous pits. Although the brimstone and the fire are said to have been rained upon the cities from the Lord out of heaven, it must be borne in mind that this expression is merely an example of the general practice of the Hebrew writers, to regard all natural phenomena as being produced by the direct agency of the Deity. That the fire and brimstone should have appeared to fall from heaven is easily understood, if it came from the crater of a volcanic cone in the immediate neighbourhood of the cities. It seems not improbable, however, that this cone may have subsequently sunk down, an occurrence not unfrequent in volcanic eruptions. The great hollow now occupied by the Dead Sea is generally, and on reasonable grounds, supposed to occupy the site of the crater of this volcano. This inland sea is the most remarkable in the world, its surface being no less than 1312 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the whole basin, in which it is contained, has undergone an immense subsidence; nor is there any reason to question the fact of this great depression and its salt lake's having been formed at the time the cities of the plain were overthrown.

The darkness that fell on the land of Egypt in the days of Moses was also, in all probability, a volcanic phenomenon. It is described as a darkness that might be felt, thus indicating that it was caused by volcanic dust pervading the air. In the region between the Nile and the Red Sea there is a tract of volcanic country, and a mountain called Djebel Dokham, or the mountain of smoke, which is a smouldering volcano. An eruption of this mountain, or of some other in the neighbourhood, may have been the means employed by Divine Providence to produce the smoke-like dust which caused Egypt to be for three days enveloped in palpable darkness. There is no greater reason to doubt that this darkness was produced

by volcanic agency, than that the thunder, lightning, and hail, which preceded it, were caused by the electricity of the atmosphere.

Not long after this event there occurred another, in which the operation of subterranean fires may be suspected. The passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites is most easily explained by supposing a portion of the bed of that sea to have been, for a short time, upheaved by the action of elastic vapours, and then allowed gradually to sink down again. In the neighbourhood of the place at which the passage is traditionally said to have been effected, there are hot sulphurous springs, and in other parts of the Red Sea there are decided traces of volcanic action.^b Indeed, some of the islands in this sea have been quite recently in volcanic activity.

The beautiful allusion to the passage of the Israelites, contained in Psalm lxxvii., indicates that an earthquake was among the remarkable phenomena which occurred at the time. "The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven, the lightnings lightened the world, *the earth trembled and shook.*" It is affirmed that the waters stood perpendicularly like a wall on either side of the path over which the Israelites passed. This statement would be most simply explained by supposing a sheer precipice to have been formed on either side of the upheaved bed of the sea, so that, instead of there being a shelving beach, the waters stood as upright as a wall; thus preventing the pursuing foe from approaching the fugitives on either flank. The upheaval of the path to a level a little above that of the beach on either shore, would seem to have been almost indispensable to the comfort of the Israelites in their march; as they would have otherwise had to make, first, a long descent towards the centre, and then a long ascent towards the further shore. But by the whole path's being raised to a level, the journey would be rendered much easier. The strong east wind,

^b Among these evidences of smouldering volcanic action may, perhaps, be reckoned a curious phenomena, which occurs at a place called Nakous, about three leagues from Tor, and about half a mile from the Red Sea. At frequent intervals during the day, and at all seasons of the year, sounds resembling the strokes of a bell proceeding from under the ground are heard at this place.

which is mentioned as having blown before the passage began, was probably designed only to render the path thoroughly dry. That the upheaved path, before sinking down again with Pharaoh's host into the sea, was first rent by large fissures, into which many of the Egyptians were precipitated, may be fairly inferred from the expression in reference to their fate, contained in the Song of Moses: "Thou stretchedst out thy hand, the *earth* swallowed them" (Exod. xv. 12).

The Israelites, on reaching the peninsula of Sinai, were destined ere long to witness the grandest and most awful of natural phenomena,—a volcano in a state of activity. The description of this remarkable occurrence is contained in Exodus xix. 16, 18,—“And it came to pass on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that were in the camp trembled. . . . And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly.” In these words we have the most ancient description known of an active volcano. The only remark which it is needful to make is, that the word rendered “trumpet” ought to be translated “tube,” and to be understood of the open tube or throat of the volcano, the sound from which is said to have waxed louder and louder. It does not appear from the description that there were any stones or streams of lava ejected from the mountain; there were only what appeared to be flames and smoke—the latter most probably composed of steam mixed with volcanic dust and ashes thrown up from the summit, accompanied by a great shaking of the mountain. The roaring of the vent would doubtless be caused by the violent rushing out of the elastic vapours. The thunder and lightning are an almost universal accompaniment of eruptions of this kind. Not a few instances have occurred in more recent times of phenomena exactly resembling those here described,—namely, the emission of flames and smoke, composed of steam, dust, and ashes, from a volcano, without any other matters being ejected.

That the description given can apply to nothing else than a

volcanic eruption admits of no doubt. The only question that arises in the mind is, why such an occasion should have been selected for the giving of the Divine Law through the medium of Moses. Nevertheless, a little reflection will suffice to shew that the place and occasion were most fitting; for nothing could tend more to exalt the ideas of the Israelites, with respect to the majesty and power of their Divine Lawgiver, than the phenomena there presented to their eyes. Their minds must have been deeply solemnized by the scene which they witnessed; and perhaps it was needful that they should be completely awe-struck, in order that the laws then and there announced to them might make a lasting impression on their memories.

But whatever may have been the divine purpose in selecting such a place and occasion for the giving of the law, there ought to be no question as to the matter of fact. There is no more reason to doubt that the smoke and flame, and the roaring of the vent, proceeded from the mountain, than that they were real smoke, real flame, and real roarings, accompanied by violent tremors. It is idle to speak of such phenomena as having been anything else than those of a volcano in action.

It is now well understood among those by whom the question has been thoroughly examined, that neither of the two mountains, Jebel Mousa nor Mount St. Katherine's, although each claiming by tradition to be the Mount Sinai from which the law was given, can be regarded as the true site of that memorable event. Neither of them answers to the descriptions given in the written record, and, in particular, they do not present sufficient camping ground at their base. In an able article in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* for April, 1860, it is shewn that the true Mount Sinai was much more probably Jebel-el-'Ojmah, one of the Horeb range, lying considerably to the north of Jebel Mousa. This mountain has in its front an ample open space for a very large encampment; and being of moderate height, it is of easy ascent. It is also said to consist of rock formations, in which volcanic action would be more likely to arise than in the ancient granites of Jebel Mousa and St. Katherine's. As the eruption which preceded the giving of the law, however, does not appear to have been attended with any ejection of lava,

it is improbable that any palpable traces of it should 'now subsist.'^c

That the country through which the Israelites had their wanderings was at that time in a state of volcanic agitation, is further evidenced by the subsequent incident of the opening of a great fissure in the ground, on which Dathan and Abiram, with their families and friends, were encamped, and into which they were all engulfed. This is a striking example of the manner in which purely natural phenomena have sometimes been made to subserve the purposes of the Deity as the moral governor of mankind.

The passage of the Israelites across the Jordan was, in all likelihood, accomplished by means of a temporary elevation of a portion of the river's bed, so as to cause the waters in the higher part of the stream, far above the point of passage, to be dammed up, and consequently the lower part of the stream, towards the Dead Sea, to fail. That such an upheaval should take place, in a country so volcanic as the valley of the Jordan, is not surprising. The marvel lies in the coincidence between this natural phenomenon and the period of the entrance of the Israelites into Palestine, according to divine appointment. But that the occurrence was not isolated, ample evidence may be found in the annals of earthquakes.

Shortly after this event, we have another instance of volcanic agencies having been brought into play, in the earthquake by which the walls of Jericho were thrown down. In this case again, the moral purposes of the Deity are seen to have been accomplished by the physical forces of nature. That there may have been other instances both of earthquakes and volcanoes in activity, subsequently to the settlement of the Israelites in Palestine, is rendered probable by the frequent allusions to such phenomena made by the authors of the Psalms and the prophecies.

^c Although in the narrative given in Exodus there is no mention of the flowing of any stream of lava or hot mud from the mountain, yet that there was something of the kind might be inferred from an allusion in the song of Deborah, "The mountains melted (or flowed) מִלִּפְנֵי ה' from before the Lord, even that Sinai from before the Lord God of Israel" (Judges v. 5). If this refer to any stream ejected from the crater, it was less likely to have been of lava than of hot mud, the traces of which would be more easily effaced.

It seems very unlikely that these writers should have been able to describe the phenomena so vividly unless they had actually seen them, or had received accounts of them from eye-witnesses. The only earthquake historically noticed, however, is that which occurred in the days of the prophet Elijah, mentioned in 1 Kings xix. 11. That such phenomena might have occurred in the ordinary course of events, without their having been noticed in the historical books of the Old Testament, is evidenced by the omission of all notice, in the books either of Kings or Chronicles, of the earthquake which happened in the reign of King Uzziah. To this convulsion distinct reference is made both by Amos (i. 1) and Zechariah (xiv. 5). Josephus affirms that it occurred at the moment when King Uzziah went into the temple to burn incense, and was smitten with leprosy in the attempt. He says that the temple was rent by the convulsion, and that at a place called Eroge, before the city, a hill was cleft in twain, and a portion of it rolled down, obstructing the roads, and damaging the king's garden. The same historian mentions another great earthquake as having occurred in Judæa, during the reign of Herod the Great, in the same year that the battle of Actium was fought, B.C. 31. He affirms that it destroyed much cattle, and about ten thousand persons in the cities, but that the army, being encamped in the field, escaped without injury.

The next mention made in the Bible of earthquakes is in the Gospel of St. Matthew, who affirms that one occurred at the death of our Saviour, and another at his resurrection. From the total silence of the other evangelists respecting these shocks, it may be inferred that they were quite local in their character, and not very severe. That which occurred at the resurrection of our Lord is indeed described as a great earthquake; but seeing the evangelist probably derived his information from the soldiers who were set to watch the sepulchre, allowance must be made for a certain amount of exaggeration due to their terror. That neither of these shocks was so extensive or severe as to cause the overthrow of buildings or the loss of life, the silence of the other evangelists and of contemporary historians renders extremely probable. Indeed, it would have been a strange and

altogether incongruous event had an earthquake, so great as to cause the destruction even of a single human being, accompanied either the death or resurrection of Him who averred that He came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them.

The only remaining notice of an earthquake, as a historical event, which occurs in the Bible, is that mentioned in Acts xvi. 26, which shook the walls of the prison at Philippi; but that also seems to have been limited in the sphere of its action, and not very severe, notwithstanding the narrator describes it as a great earthquake. In this case also allowance must be made for the terror which it seems to have inspired.

The whole valley of the Jordan, more especially about the Lake of Gennesareth, is a very volcanic country. Between the river Jordan and the city of Damascus lies a desert tract, which throughout its whole extent exhibits decided traces of volcanic action. It is therefore no marvel that earthquakes should have been of frequent occurrence in those regions. Several of great violence, and very destructive in their effects, have happened in quite recent times.

Let it not be imagined that, in referring to those remarkable volcanic phenomena recorded in the Bible, as having been produced by natural causes, operating according to determinate physical laws, it is intended in any degree to disparage aught of the miraculous that any of them may involve. Quite the contrary. The real marvel in all those cases was not the physical phenomenon itself, but its exact coincidence in point of time with some moral event, and the manner in which the operation of the physical laws was made to further some moral design. To hold these phenomena to have resulted from isolated acts of arbitrary power, adopted for the mere purpose of effecting some moral end, or of displaying the divine partiality for a favoured nation, would be to regard them from too low a point of view. Whereas, when we look upon the phenomena as resulting from the operation of determinate physical laws, and contemplate their coincidence in point of time with some moral event, and their effect in accomplishing some moral purpose, we perceive in such a coincidence and such an effect the most conclusive evidences that the Author of the physical laws, and the Moral

Ruler of the world, is one and the same all-knowing and all-powerful Mind, a lesson which mankind have ever been slow to learn.

It seems most reasonable to believe that, in the majority of the cases cited, the Deity, by virtue of his omniscience, knowing the exact moment when a certain particular effect would be produced by some physical cause, through the operation of the laws which He has Himself ordained, so over-ruled the wills of His intelligent creatures, by means of adequate motives, as to bring their actions to coincide in point of time with those physical occurrences, in order to their being influenced by them in their result. For such a belief suggests a far higher idea of the Divine Government than any that can be imbibed from supposing the phenomena to have been caused by special acts of interference with the operation of the physical laws, resorted to on the instant for accomplishing, as it were by the force of circumstances, the moral design which the Deity had in view.

Take, for example, the earthquake that overthrew the walls of Jericho. To imagine that the Deity, by an arbitrary act of His will, produced this earthquake for the sole purpose of shaking down the walls of that city, so that the Israelites, His favoured people, might obtain possession of it more easily, would be to form an erroneous notion of the divine methods of procedure in the government of the universe. The mind acquires a far higher and truer conception when it adopts the view, that the Omniscient foreknew that, in virtue of the physical laws which He has ordained, an earthquake would at a particular moment throw down the walls of Jericho, and that He so swayed the minds of the Hebrew leader and his followers, as to bring them to besiege it at that precise time, in order to His delivering it into their hands an easy prey, such being the end which He had in view.

Another striking example occurs in the remarkable event which happened in the days of Joshua, when the sun appeared "in the sight of Israel" to stand still upon Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Ajalon. It would be an error to suppose this wonderful phenomenon to have involved any breach of the physical laws which God has appointed for the regulation of the

heavenly bodies, or the physical appearance to have been arbitrarily caused for the mere purpose of enabling the Hebrews to complete their victory over the Amorites. The apparent standing still of the sun and moon was, doubtless, occasioned by an extraordinary display of that beautiful phenomenon, the mirage, which is not uncommon in southern climes. It arises from a particular state of the atmosphere, which so affects its refractive power as completely to alter the apparent position of objects. In virtue of this refraction, the sun, on approaching the horizon, would continue to appear above it for a considerable time after it had actually sunk below it, and the daylight would thus be prolonged for an unusual period. Now, wonderful as this phenomenon really was, the miraculous ingredient was not the natural appearance itself, but its coincidence in point of time with the battle between the Hebrews and the Amorites; its occurring at the moment when the former had begun to prevail over the latter, and its prolonging the daylight for a sufficient length of time, to enable them to render their victory complete.⁴ Here, again, the correct view to take is, that the Omniscient, knowing that this phenomenon would occur at that particular time and place, in virtue of the operation of the physical laws which He had ordained, so influenced the minds both of the Israelites and the Amorites, as to bring their armies into collision at that same time and place, and so overruled the event, that the natural phenomenon became instrumental in completing the overthrow of the Amorites, which was the end destined to be accomplished.

It is allowable, however, to suppose that there may have been another important object kept in view, in thus establishing coincidences between certain natural phenomena and particular occurrences in the history of the Hebrew nation, namely, to insure the preservation of a record of the events. Mankind, in

⁴ Our translation conveys an erroneous impression upon this point, in saying that "the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down by the space of a whole day." The true rendering is, "the sun stood still in the horizon, and hasted not to go down like perfect day;" the time being that portion of the evening when, save for this phenomenon, it would have been dark.

general, are so absorbed in their own pursuits, so intent on promoting their own welfare, or in fighting with their neighbours, that natural phenomena pass by unheeded, unless they happen to be in some manner connected with their affairs. Of their negligence, in this particular, we have an example in the entire absence from the Bible of any record of a phenomenon so remarkable as a total eclipse, either of the sun or moon.* The earthquake in the days of Uzziah passed by unrecorded at the time; and we should have known nothing of it save for an incidental allusion to it in the writings of two of the prophets. Had the walls of Jericho been overthrown by an earthquake at any other time than the moment at which the city was beleaguered by the Hebrews, we should have remained ignorant of the event. Save for the battle between Chedorlaomer and the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah, we should never have learnt that there were bituminous pits in the plain where those cities stood before they were overthrown. Of that overthrow itself it is doubtful whether any record would have been preserved had not the nephew of Abraham been dwelling in Sodom at the time, and marvellously escaped. Even the remarkable phenomenon of the apparent standing still of the sun upon Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Ajalon, would have passed unheeded except for its connection with the victory of the Hebrews over the Amorites. In like manner, it is to the coincidence between the giving of the law and the volcanic phenomena of Sinai, that we are indebted for a knowledge of that eruption. Had it occurred either before the arrival of the Israelites in the wilderness, or after their entrance into Palestine, the smoke and flame of the mountain would, like many other similar occurrences, have been ere long buried in oblivion.

P.

* Josephus records an eclipse of the moon, which happened in the reign of Herod, in the fourth year before the beginning of the Christian era; but this is the only mention of an eclipse of either the sun or moon made by any ancient Jewish historian. Josephus seems to have regarded this eclipse rather as an indication of the divine displeasure at the conduct of Herod, than as a merely natural event.

RECENT BOOKS BY THIERRY, MICHAUD, AND DE BROGLIE.*

1. M. AMÉDÉE THIERRY has for some years devoted all his talent to the study of the Roman empire at the time of its decline. He has taken up, partly, the same theme as Gibbon, but treated it from a totally different point of view. Instead of the sneering tone, the prejudiced mind, the silly declamation of the English historian, we find in the pages of the French writer a careful statement of facts, and a cordial love of Christianity. It is no use saying that prejudice and partiality can also lead the historian to overrate the services rendered to the world by the preaching of the Gospel. Turn to the *Historiæ Augustæ Scriptores*, examine the works of Herodian, Lampridius, and their contemporaries; then say whether the worst enemy of heathenism could employ, in describing the last agonies of Roman civilization, colours more powerful and, at the same time, more repulsive than those which the panegyrists of that society themselves employed.

The last production of M. Amédée Thierry is one which calls for a special notice in the pages of this Journal; it is a monograph of Saint Jerom, and, therefore, presents to us a twofold interest, whether we consider it merely as the sketch of an interesting epoch in the annals of the world, or as the portrait of one of the most remarkable representatives of early Christianity. M. Thierry has, in the majority of cases, allowed his hero, very wisely, to tell his own story; he has made admirable use of the voluminous correspondence which Jerom carried on with a band of fervent admirers, and the work we are now noticing might, in point of fact, be almost called the memoirs of Saint Jerom written by himself. It would be difficult to name, in the whole range of Church history, a subject at the same time more inviting and more perplexing than that

* 1. *Saint Jérôme, la Société Chrétienne à Rome, et l'émigration Romaine en Terre Sainte*, par M. Amédée Thierry. Paris: Didier.

2. *Guillaume de Champeaux et les écoles de Paris au xii^e siècle, d'après des documents inédits*, par M. l'Abbé Michaud. Paris: Didier.

3. *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au iv^e siècle*, par M. Albert de Broglie, de l'Académie Française. 3 partie, Valentinien et Théodose. Paris: Didier.

selected by our author. Perplexing, on account of the many-sided character which the artist has to draw, and, consequently, of the difficulty there is in giving a complete view of it within the proportions of a moderate sized canvass. One student may select for his consideration Jerom the controversialist, with his eloquence nearly equal to that of Cicero; another will rather examine the divine whose decisions were almost uniformly accepted as law by the Church; for a third critic, especially interested in questions connected with sacred literature, Jerom's labours on the text of the Holy Scriptures, his merits as a translator, a commentator, and a Biblical expositor will prove more attractive. Finally, the historian of the Church will love to examine in him the ascetic preacher, the upholder of monastic institutions, the cenobite *par excellence*.

M. Amédée Thierry has not recoiled before the difficulty of giving in one single work these several aspects of Jerom's character, and we think that he has admirably triumphed over the obstacles which so wide a theme presented to him. His two volumes are an excellent contribution to ecclesiastical history; beautifully written, full of details, without being unnecessarily diffuse, evidencing the most extensive reading, and yet free from all affectation of erudition, they will add much to the author's reputation.

The first book begins with a description of the state of society at Rome during the fourth century, and if we would conjure up before our eyes the dismal picture, we must, as M. Thierry observes, cast aside all our classical recollections, and forget that the old Quirites ever resembled the grand heroes we read of in the pages of Livy or of Cicero. Let us study the *Panegyrici Veteres*, the correspondence of Symmachus, the treatises of the early Latin fathers; there we shall find the documents from which a correct idea can be formed of the civilized world; at a time when heathenism had not yet died out, and when Christianity was already becoming tainted by luxury and ease. "The senators," says our author, "were certainly no longer under the reign of Constantius, men of the mould of a Cincinnatus, or a Cato; neither were they worthy of being classed amongst the strong-minded wretches who, towards

the end of the commonwealth, hurried on their native country to ruin, as Catiline or Clodius did, in order to oppress or sell it; nor can we find amongst them those degraded patricians who, like Gracchus the gladiator, took delight in prostituting their illustrious name in the exciting combats of the circus; those men had nothing of the Roman about them; no Roman vices, still less of Roman virtues. To find their patterns, we must consult the annals of Babylonia and of Persia." And the rabble, the populace, what shall we say of them? Shall we weary our readers with the melancholy and repulsive picture of those idle vagabonds, turbulent, cowardly, incapable of carrying on an honourable industry, living on the public distributions which the emperors made from fear or love of popularity? Shall we ask Ammianus Marcellinus to tell us something about the habits of the *Cimessores*, the *Statarii*, the *Semicupæ*, and the whole rascaldom of the metropolis of the world? No; we turn to the Church with a feeling of relief; but, alas, here too we find that degeneracy has crept stealthily in; and if the patrician of the days of Constantius is no longer a Cato, so the Christian of the same epoch falls deplorably short of "the stature of Christ." The love of ease, of pleasure, and of luxury, the thirst for gold infected the clergy as well as the laity, to say nothing of the spirit of ambition and of other vices still more hateful. Various circumstances had concurred in investing the bishop of Rome with extraordinary power and dignity, and, accordingly, every election to that see was marked by the most scandalous disorders; nay, often even by bloodshed. We find in the letters of Saint Jerom the following characteristic anecdote. Damasus was one day endeavouring to bring over to the Christian faith Pretextatus, prefect of the city, a man of wit and a sceptic, although he held the office of pontiff of Vesta and of the sun; "Oh!" answered he, laughing, "if you will only make me bishop of Rome, I shall embrace Christianity at once."

A reaction against so distressing a state of things was inevitable. Athanasius, persecuted on account of his firm attachment to the Christian faith, and his denunciations of Arianism, arrived in Rome with two Egyptian monks, Ammonius and Isidorus, both coming from the desert of Nitria. Through the

influence of these eminent Christians, a revival (to use the well-known word) took place in Rome; a revival which M. Thierry describes towards the conclusion of his first book, and the leading promoter of which was the celebrated Marcella.

After having thus given what may be called the preliminaries of his subject, our author enters upon the biography of Saint Jerom; he accompanies him through his journeys, relates the various efforts he made on behalf of the orthodox faith, and arriving at the period of his residence at Rome, he is necessarily led to give an account of the Pope Damasus, with whom Jerom was on terms of intimate friendship. It was not likely that so earnest a man as the subject of M. Thierry's book would escape the shafts of jealousy and the anger of a lax and immoral priesthood. The narrative of the innumerable discussions into which he was drawn occupies the fourth book; and the copious extracts of the reformer's correspondence and controversial treatises, placed before our eyes, shew us in Jerom a man who combined the humour and eloquence of Luther with the indomitable will of Calvin. He was obliged, however, to leave Rome, and in company with a small band of pilgrims, he started for the Holy Land.

When thus bidding farewell to his Italian friends, Jerom certainly did not mean to settle down into repose, but the labour he anticipated was not that of theological controversies. On his arrival, nevertheless, in the East, he found the orthodox faith threatened, as he thought, by a new and most formidable enemy; the doctrines of Origen were rapidly gaining ground throughout Palestine, and he felt it his duty to oppose them. M. Amédée Thierry points out with much tact what were the incontestable merits of Origen, what his defects: on the one hand, extraordinary industry, honesty of purpose, a deeply-rooted love of the truth, and an immense fund of learning; on the other, too great a leaning towards mystical speculations, towards those dreams and fancies which characterized the metaphysicians of the Alexandrine school. His disciples, as is generally the case, went further than himself; they exaggerated his peculiar tenets, and it was easy for the strict orthodox party to extract from their doctrines a certain number of objectionable

propositions. These referred chiefly, 1st, to the pre-existence of souls; 2nd, to the resurrection of the dead; 3rd, to the duration of punishment in the next world; 4th, to the historical character of certain books in the Old Testament. On all these points, and on several others arising from them, Jerom found himself obliged to carry on a desperate struggle with some of the most eminent representatives of the Church in Palestine—John, bishop of Jerusalem, Rufinus, and, in the first instance, Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria. The various incidents of this debate form the subject of M. Amédée Thierry's eighth book.

But if the opposition of Jerom to the views of the Origenists seems in a certain sense natural and easy to be understood, the dispute he had to maintain against Saint Augustine takes us, at first, quite by surprise. What possible antagonism could there be between two such men, equally regarded by their contemporaries and by posterity as the pillars of orthodoxy? M. Amédée Thierry discovers the reason of this conflict in the opposite ways by which the two champions had arrived at an intimate knowledge of Christianity.

“Augustine,” says he, “studied Christianity from the metaphysical point of view, and to that point of view he made miracles and prophecy subordinate. Thanks, however, to the boldness of his glance, he knew how to arrange and adapt together the various parts of his doctrine, so as to produce the most splendid, the grandest construction that Christian science has ever brought about. There was the secret of Augustine's power; there was the origin of the glory he has acquired. On the other hand, he lacked the resources which exegesis requires; his knowledge of Greek was imperfect, of Hebrew he absolutely knew nothing; as for Church history, his acquaintance with it had been derived from the incomplete compilations published in western Europe. Plato himself, whom he had taken for his guide in the obscurities of his faith, he could read fluently only through the medium of Latin translations, whilst he studied Platonism in the very arbitrary interpretations put upon it by the new school which usurped the master's name. The Greek Fathers, those founders of Biblical criticism, were not a whit more familiar to him, and, strange to say, he scarcely knew

Origen, the hero of so many struggles, the noise of which resounded constantly around him. But Augustine possessed a creative genius; he guessed in Plato what he could not read, and he made for himself a method of exegesis. Let us add, that the power of ideas has its limits, and that logic is not always a good substitute for the study of facts."

To this portrait M. Amédée Thierry opposes one of Jerom, whom he shews attached exclusively to the Holy Scriptures, seeing in them alone the key of true knowledge, and setting little store by the brilliant, but often erratic, conceptions of philosophy. The cause of the controversy between Saint Augustine and our hero was the latter's commentary on Saint Paul's epistles, in which the author of the *De Civitate Dei* fancied he discovered some dangerous propositions on truth. We shall not enter into the details of this dispute, nor have we time to give an account here of Jerom's last days, which are related by M. Amédée Thierry with a great deal of eloquence and true feeling.

The concluding pages of the second volume are taken up by the history of the Empress Placidia. It is an episode which forms a sequel to M. Thierry's previous work, entitled *Trois Ministres de l'Empire Romain sous les Fils de Théodose*, and is extremely interesting, although bearing only incidentally upon the state of the Church during the fifth century. By way of appendix, we have Jerom's letter to Eustochium on virginity, and Augustine's epistle to Count Bonifacius. These two documents, together with the numerous extracts given by the author in the course of his work, will serve as illustrative specimens of controversial literature during an important epoch in the annals of the Church.

2. Although the times of scholasticism are gone, and metaphysical speculation has, since the time of Descartes, been flowing into quite a different channel, yet we cannot help turning back with admiration to the old glories of mediæval philosophy, and lingering fondly amongst the shades of Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and Peter Lombard. We feel that the system we are now alluding to formed part and parcel of a dis-

tinct social organization ; it was one item, and an important one, in a gigantic scheme which included the Church and the world, ecclesiastical and secular polity, the life which now is, and that which is to come.

The self-styled *philosophers* of the eighteenth century might, out of hatred to Christianity, endeavour to decry every principle, every institution, more or less connected with it ; but we have learned to take a fairer estimate now, even of the views we cannot cordially approve ; and the numerous works lately published on the history of scholasticism shew very clearly that the services rendered in days of yore by the doctors of the Church during the middle ages are, at present, recognized as they should be. “ *La philosophie scholastique,*” said M. Cousin, “ *a aussi sa grandeur : elle mérite l’interêt de l’histoire et par elle-même et par les événements auxquels elle se lie ; et quelque chose de cet intérêt doit se réfléchir jusque sur son enfance, si obscure et si négligée.*” This appeal, we all know, was responded to in the most remarkable manner, and the list of French works published within the last twenty years on the history of scholasticism includes many volumes which have obtained a world-wide reputation. Besides M. Cousin’s own lectures, we might mention M. Saint René Taillandier’s monograph of Scot Erigena, the books of M. de Rémusat on Saint Anselm of Canterbury and Abélard, M. B. Hauréau’s *Histoire de la Philosophie Scholastique*, and M. Jourdain’s Thomas Aquinas. To this brilliant catalogue let us now add the subject of the present article,—*Guillaume de Champeaux, et les Ecoles de Paris au xii^e siècle.*

It is quite obvious that the appreciation of the life and doctrines of very many mediæval teachers must be surrounded by almost endless difficulties. Some amongst the most influential have left only the scantiest remains of their erudition, and a few imperfect fragments are all we have by which to judge them. Such is precisely the case with Guillaume de Champeaux. Forty-two disjointed pieces recently discovered in the Troyes library, two charters, and four or five other items, constitute the sole surviving monuments of one who led public opinion in his own time, and who deserves to be ranked amongst the greatest philosophers of former days.

Archdeacon of Paris, scholar of Notre Dame, founder of that university which was soon to become, according to M. Cousin's expression, "the great school of Europe," originator of the abbey of Saint Victor, which gave to France and to the Church so many men of whom it would be difficult to say whether their real worth or the reputation they obtained was greater; bishop of Chalons, friend and director of Saint Bernard, ambassador of the Pope Calixtus II. to the emperor Henry V., Guillaume de Champeaux obtained from his contemporaries his full share of praise on account both of his public and of his private life. In his thirty-sixth letter to the abbot Hugh, Saint Bernard calls him "*episcopum sanctum et doctum.*" Writing to the canons of Audicourt, he gives him a prominent mention amongst the most illustrious men of the day. "*. multorum illustrium virorum,*" says he, "*et maxime clarissimi viri Willelmi Catalaunensis episcopi*" (Inter epist. S. Bernardi III.). In the notes of the council of Beauvais, held in 1120, Liriard, bishop of Soissons, surnames him "*columna doctorum.*" "*Mortuo Anselmo Laudunensi et Gulielmo Catalaunensi,*" says the abbot Hugh Metellus (Epist. iv. ad Innocent.), "*ignis verbi Dei in terra deficit.*"

We might go on adding to these testimonies many others of very celebrated doctors, both ancient and modern; the question is now, why Guillaume de Champeaux should have been not only forgotten, but even calumniated and misrepresented? The Abbé Michaud, as a reason for this, states two facts. In the first place, we are always inclined to be ungrateful towards those who have been our masters; Albertus Magnus, for instance, was reckoned as a prodigy of science, as an incomparable philosopher, before his pupil, Thomas Aquinas, obtained the reputation he has ever since enjoyed; as soon as the "angelic doctor" had become really celebrated, Albertus Magnus was forgotten. In the same manner Guillaume de Champeaux was obliged to retire, and give up the palm of popularity to the brilliant Abélard and the bold Roscelin. We must not forget also that freedom of thought is a principle which all generous minds are fond of advocating; whenever a cause, an idea, a theory, appears to be persecuted, or at least is under suspicion, champions arise on

every side, anxious to break a lance in favour of those whom they suppose to be the victims of persecution; they do not stop to enquire whether their clients have been condemned rightly or through some misconception; and as long as the unfortunate victims can say that the cause they represent is that of liberty, they are sure to find plenty of apologists. M. Michaud goes on to shew that the reputation of Roscelin and of Abélard has been very much overrated; the accurate study of mediæval philosophy will, he believes, increase the glory of Guillaume de Champeaux, whilst it must, on the other hand, take much from the fictitious celebrity which has hitherto surrounded especially the name of Abélard.

We shall not dwell here upon the accusation of jealousy, ambition, and vindictiveness brought forward against our metaphysician; suffice it to say, that the only evidence we have on that subject is that of adversaries, which, accordingly, we are in no-wise bound to take into any consideration. There is another charge, however, which is still more serious, and deserving closer attention, though it is quite as futile as those we have just now been mentioning; namely, that of Pantheism. “L’hypothèse de Guillaume de Champeaux,” says M. Hauréau, “est au jugement de Bayle, le Spinosisme non développé. C’est une assertion que nous allons confirmer en quelques mots.” Now, if the teaching of the philosopher really inclined towards Pantheism, is it not wonderful, to say the least, that none of his contemporaries should have noticed it? They were far better circumstanced than we are to appreciate the doctrines of a great and celebrated instructor; they had at their disposal his works, they could attend his lectures, hear him discuss with his pupils, and judge for themselves from the best data possible. Yet not one of them did even so much as hint at the supposed Pantheism of Gullielmus Campellensis; whereas, we men of the nineteenth century, obliged to adopt as the substratum of our conclusions a small number of detached propositions, a few disjointed paragraphs, we take upon ourselves to bring forth against him the most serious charge. The fact is, that modern historians of philosophy have judged Guillaume de Champeaux from a prejudiced point of view; they have come to the study of his works with

conclusions already made, and they have therefore been guilty of the greatest unfairness. It is for the purpose of placing the facts of the case in their proper light, and of vindicating the character and authority of Guillaume de Champeaux as a teacher, that M. l'Abbé Michaud has composed his interesting volume.

Our author begins by a few general remarks on the history of scholasticism. Before the time of Saint Anselm of Canterbury, great intellectual activity prevailed no doubt in the Church and the schools; important questions were discussed, and serious problems examined; there was, at the same time, no settled system of doctrines, no method, no regular plan of teaching. Bede, Alcuin, Rhabanus Maurus, Pope Sylvester II., Lanfranc himself, represented that epoch which extended as far as the twelfth century. By degrees, however, all this energy, spent in isolated and independent efforts, settles down; the Palatine schools have dwindled away, and almost entirely disappeared; but in their stead, new centres of education have risen, and whilst the various seminaries connected with the Church are in full vigour, private lecture-rooms or classes are opened throughout the *Quartier Latin* in Paris. The impulse given to metaphysics by John Scot Erigena and Gerbert is bearing its fruit, and an era of progress has begun. This brings us to the commencement of the twelfth century, when Guillaume de Champeaux was at the height of his reputation.

After giving us the early biography of the philosopher, M. Michaud examines, in a series of most interesting chapters, the merits of the system he upheld, and is thus led to discuss very fully the relative merits of nominalism and realism. The question at issue between Guillaume de Champeaux and his opponents was, it will be remembered, whether the universal ideas which we form, and which distinguish us from the brute creation, are a purely subjective result of our reason, or whether they rest upon objective realities. Gullielmus started from this principle, that every effect has a cause proportionate to it, and he deduced from his postulate an affirmative answer to the question we have just enunciated. The further query now is, whether our philosopher did not fall into some exaggeration; whether, in his fear of weakening the reality of our conceptions, he was not led to increase beyond measure the reality of objects. If our concep-

tions have only a modal reality, quite distinct from the substantial reality of the soul, Guilielmus Campellensis has evidently exaggerated in assigning to them as a cause a reality more than modal, namely, the substantial reality of the objects themselves. But if these conceptions, far from being the modal entities which modern philosophy has so much blamed scholasticism for upholding, are really the substance of the soul, so far as it is determined in such or such a degree of perfection according to the degree of intensity of its life, or the degree of union with the types and laws which regulate that life; are we wrong in considering the determinating causes of these conceptions, that is to say, the objective universals, as the substantial essence of things, so far as it is realized in such or such a degree of perfection, according to the degree of intensity of the forces, or the degree of union of these forces with the types or laws which regulate them?

The first book of M. Michaud's work treats of metaphysics; the second introduces us to the domains of theology, and it describes to us the commencement of that abbey of Saint Victor where so great a development was given to the inner life of the soul, under the direction of the eminent men Hugh, Richard, and Walter. As in his previous discussion our author has been led to examine, *à propos* of Guillaume de Champeaux, the leading problems of pure metaphysics, so here he touches upon some of the great difficulties connected with theology. The ever recurring dispute about the relative claims of authority and free inquiry, amongst other kindred topics, engages his attention, and he falls into the common error of considering Protestantism as a mis-application of the cardinal principle of free discussion. M. Michaud, we are happy to say, distinctly repudiates the opinion of the Ultramontanists, who denounce as downright wickedness all enquiry whatever; but we must protest on the other hand against the error which makes Protestantism responsible for the false teaching of Socinians, Atheists, and Positivists.

After having distinguished himself as a philosopher and a divine, Guillaume de Champeaux took also an active part in the political questions of his time. Elected bishop and count of Châlons-sur-Marne, he was present at several councils; Saint

Bernard was by him consecrated as abbot of Clairvaux, and during the course of his episcopate he did a great deal towards introducing that reformation which, if heartily and universally carried out in the various forms of discipline and doctrine, would have probably rendered the movement of the sixteenth century either altogether useless, or at least less radical than it turned out to be.

M. Michaud's final chapter gives us a general appreciation of Guillaume's character, and of the times amidst which he lived. The twelfth century deserves to be studied closely, because, as our author remarks, it was an epoch of formation. Intellectual activity prevailed everywhere, and the utmost freedom of thought was exercised in the wide field of philosophy and of theology. The communal movement, energetically carried out, especially through the large towns of northern France, inaugurated, so to say, the power of the bourgeoisie, and the whole of society, both religious and political, was alive with healthy and vigorous action. On the list of illustrious personages whose talents, piety, and genius reflect undying glory upon those times, Guillaume de Champeaux deserves a conspicuous place; let us add that he has found an excellent historian in M. l'Abbé Michaud. The volume which we have just briefly noticed is a monograph of the highest merit, and it amply proves that the glory of the French school of metaphysicians shines now as brightly as it ever did.

3. The Prince de Broglie has, by the publication of his two last volumes, completed a work which will secure for him a distinguished place amongst modern historians. The Church and the empire during the fourth century:—such was his subject; the field has already been traversed by more than one writer, but it is so full of interest that we can well imagine the earnest student being repeatedly attracted to it.

The first volume of this new series opens with the reign of Valentinian, a prince who, with many defects, and especially an exaggerated sense of his own dignity, combined the most sterling qualities. Upright, pious, fond of work, high principled, he resolved to govern with the strictest impartiality, and his aim

was to sever the interests of religion from those of political rule. He had seen Julian the Apostate absolutely kept under by his sophists, and Constantine obliged to submit to the imperious exigencies of intriguing court prelates; he would never allow himself, he thought, to be thus made the tool of religious controversies, and whilst behaving towards all with the utmost impartiality, he would be the slave of neither priest nor hierophant. The part was a difficult one to play; what with the heathen, the Arians, and the orthodox Christians, it required an unusual amount of tact to keep clear of all the obstacles which the state of society threw in the way of the emperor. Let us say that Valentinian managed extremely well at first, and that the system of uncompromising fairness he had taken as his ideal was steadily adhered to by him. During the scenes of violence and terror, for instance, which the administration of Maximinus occasioned in Rome, the emperor took particular care to explain that, whilst punishing those persons who were guilty of the crime of magic, he meant to respect strictly the public worship as practised by the Pagans, and even the augural ceremonies connected with them. "I do not confound," said he, writing to the senate, "the art of the Aruspices with the misdeeds of those who are given up to incantations, and I by no means make a crime either of that art or of the religious observances authorized by my predecessors. I call to witness the laws which I have passed since the beginning of my empire, and in virtue of which I have allowed every one to follow the particular form of religion most agreeable to him. It is not the augural art which I forbid, but only the misuse that can be made of it." And as if to give a still more decisive proof of his impartiality, a few days after, having uttered the declaration we have just quoted, he published another edict, granting to the heathen pontiffs all the immunities and privileges belonging to the dignity of count, provided they had obtained that dignity by legitimate means, and without having recourse to intrigue. Valentinian was equally just in his conduct towards the Jews, whom the Christians hated still more, perhaps, than they did the Pagans. One day, some soldiers on the march had taken possession of a synagogue by force; whereupon he blamed severely in a rescript the ma-

gistrate who had sanctioned that deed of violence, saying : “ You should have respected a place consecrated to the worship of the Deity.”

It is a matter of deep regret, however, that the misrepresentations made of Valentinian’s policy, and the attacks to which his government was subjected on all sides, should have had the effect of rendering positively cruel a character naturally inclined to sternness, and of thus giving the appearance of vindictiveness to a scheme of administration really based upon quite an opposite principle.

The life of Saint Basil, and the history of the council of Constantinople, form two of the most interesting chapters in the Prince de Broglie’s first volume. Respecting the illustrious bishop whose genius and piety shed so much lustre over the episcopal throne of Cæsarea, our author is particularly just and appreciative. He shews in him the harmonious union of the learned divine and the wise administrator, the pastor and the ruler, the student deeply acquainted with all the mysteries of heathen philosophy, and the Christian who has drunk deep from the well of evangelical knowledge. “ Basil,” says M. de Broglie, “ is the first orator the Church can boast of. Before him, Athanasius had harangued the soldiers of the faith as a general who storms the wall of a citadel ; Origen had dogmatized to an assembly of students ; Basil is the first who addresses to men of every rank and every condition, in season and out of season, exhortations in a style at once natural and erudite, the simplicity and the vigour of which are never impaired by its elegance. No language is more flowery than his own, more replete with classical reminiscences ; and yet none is more easy, more accessible to minds of every capacity. Study has done nothing but prepare for him a treasure ever opened, where inspiration freely draws for its daily necessities. His fellow-scholar, Gregory himself, cannot be compared with him for that facility which is at the same time brilliant and readily available. Gregory’s imagination is livelier, perhaps, but it is self-seeking, and the orator, engrossed by the expression he is in quest of, or the idea he perceives, sometimes forgets the man who is listening to him. For Gregory, eloquence is an ornament ; for Basil, it is a

dagger, the hilt of which, be it ever so ornamented with carvings and figures, serves only to drive the blade further in. Gregory often betrays the mere declaimer, and always the poet. The orator alone breathes in Basil."

And at the conclusion of the same chapter:—"Such is Basil: science kept in check by doctrine, and yet moving freely and gracefully within the circle of doctrine; eloquence always having for its aim the good of souls, but adorned with all the fascination of antiquity, and fed upon classical science; all the faculties which constitute the statesman devoted to the administration of a church; in one word, the genius of this world exclusively enlisted in the service of faith. Basil founds neither Christian politics, nor a Christian philosophy, nor even a Christian literature; for he does not step beyond the precincts of the sanctuary; he affects no magistracy, he gives no other teaching except that of the Gospel. But his contemporaries, whilst they look at him, compare him with the rivals or the persecutors by whom he is surrounded; as a contrast to that bright figure, the old empire offers to them politicians like Valens, and men of letters like Libanius. The parallel carries its own lesson with it. Where the respect of men, where their admiration goes, there, sooner or later, by a kind of irresistible current, the reality of power must also be found. A Church which produces men like Basil is already qualified to receive the government of the world."

Prince de Broglie passes an unfavourable judgment upon the council of Constantinople. "Its work," he says, "was carried on without energy, hastily finished, preserved no doubt from doctrinal error by the protection which the Holy Spirit grants to His most worthless interpreters; but at the same time the laborious process of its formation, interrupted by painful hesitations, had neither edified the lookers-on, nor prepared the faithful for respect."

It is quite certain that the Christian Church during the fourth century was doomed to pass through an ordeal much more trying than any it had yet experienced, and than most of those which in later times were appointed for its purification. The last efforts of expiring heathenism, supported by the *prestige* of

the Roman name, the progress of heresy, the rough and uncultivated nature of the new converts, seemed combining together under the influence of the powers of darkness to destroy the work of Christianity almost before it had been able to pass, if we may so say, through its probationary state. Theodosius ascends the throne, and around him the conflicting interests of orthodoxy and Arianism, Christians, heathens, and Jews are equally loud, equally exacting. M. de Broglie's second volume relates to us the events of that important reign; and as the noble figure of Saint Basil filled the foreground of the former picture, here Saint Ambrose arrests our attention and occupies the scene. The sedition of Thessalonica, originally arising from the most futile cause,—the imprisonment of a favourite charioteer, is one of the most striking episodes in the reign of Theodosius; because, to quote Prince de Broglie's remark, "it shews both the danger of unlimited power and the universal necessity of repentance." Modern infidelity may laugh at the idea of a despot like Theodosius trembling under the just censure of Saint Ambrose, giving way to extreme sorrow, and overwhelmed by a sense of his sin; but we think that the sight is a noble one, and the emperor's humiliation, his deep repentance, and his open acknowledgment of the guilt he had committed, redound more to his honour than the wisest measures he ever carried out for the administration of his dominions. It is impossible to overrate the consequences which the conduct of Theodosius on this occasion had in strengthening the cause of Christianity, and destroying that of heathenism. Never did a greater spectacle create more emotion; the priest and the penitent were both alike objects of admiration; for whilst true courage had obtained the mastery over mere force, on the other hand pride and the lust of power had succumbed to the voice of conscience. The Church, this time, had raised its voice, not to defend its own interest, nor to vindicate its authority against that of the secular power, but to maintain and uphold the rights of the moral law, which keeps under its sway not only the peasant in his cottage, but the prince on his throne. The superiority of the Christian faith was henceforth firmly established, and its majesty placed beyond any doubt.

Prince de Broglie terminates his second volume by an eloquent chapter, which sums up his whole work, and points out the leading features in the grand scenes he has endeavoured to describe. At the beginning of the fourth century, he remarks, the Church, like the apostle Saint Paul during the first few days of his navigation, is persecuted, captive, confined in the hold of the ship, in the humble and despised attitude of prayer. The last years of the same century shew us the Church sitting at the helm alone, calm amidst the anxieties which pervaded the whole of society, and resisting the storm, whilst all the passengers are giving way to fear and discouragement.

The great problem for the first Christian emperors was the reconciling of the respective claims of the Church and the empire. How could they avail themselves of the resources offered to them by the faith of the Gospel without seeming to place the ecclesiastical power under subjection to the temporal one? how could they, on the other hand, place themselves on the stand-point of their old traditional policy, and yet avoid the suspicion of allowing too much authority to the Church, and to a power comparatively new, over the old law of the Quirites, and the long-established principles by which the government had always been carried on? The relations between the Church and the State are always extremely difficult to settle, even when both powers spring, as they do in our own days, from the same spiritual origin; what must they have been when they owed their origin to two civilizations diametrically opposed to one another, and not having one single feature in common?

The problem was, we acknowledge it, an exceedingly difficult one; so much so, that it has always been the cause of the bitterest quarrels, and that it has exposed Christianity itself to the most unjust, the most unwarrantable accusations. Prince de Broglie, like the majority of enlightened Roman Catholics, does not believe that the relations between the Church and the State should always be the same, and that the pictorial embodiment of a Christian commonwealth should be a stern, all-powerful emperor, watching, with drawn sword, at the door of an ecclesiastical council. In the order of human events, we must assume as probable that what is, will not remain so throughout

all ages; that change is the great law, and that history does not reproduce itself. We may affirm that mediæval society has disappeared for ever, and that the world will not see again the Church invested with the power of governing society, and providing for it its laws, its police, almost its daily food. But we do not see why the democratic institutions of modern Europe should be incompatible with the free action of the Church; for, notwithstanding what infidels may say, it is to Christianity that political society owes all the good elements it can boast of; and, after the wonderful transformation which the Gospel has brought about, surely its power to preserve modern society from dissolution cannot be doubted. This is the conclusion of Prince de Broglie's interesting work; we endorse it most cordially, and we say, unhesitatingly, that so long as Christianity is identified with persons like Count de Montalembert, M. Guizot, M. Gratry, and the Prince de Broglie himself, we need not despair of the fate of civilization.

GUSTAVE MASSON.



Anointing.—As the custom of inaugural anointing first occurs among the Israelites, immediately after they left Egypt, and no example of the same kind is met with previously, it is fair to conclude that the practice, and the notions connected with it, were acquired in that country. “With the Egyptians, as with the Jews,” the investiture to any sacred office, as that of king or priest, was confirmed by this external sign; and as the Jewish lawgiver mentions the ceremony of pouring oil upon the head of the high priest *after* he had put on his entire dress, with the mitre and crown, the Egyptians represent the anointing of their priests and kings *after* they were attired in their full robes, with the cap and crown upon their heads. Some of the sculptures introduce a priest pouring oil over the monarch.—Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*.

NOTE ON THE TAXING—LUKE II. 2.

BY T. G. BONNEY, M.A., F.G.S.,

Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

THE ingenious solution proposed by Zumpt, viz., that Quirinus was twice governor of Syria, and that he probably succeeded T. Quintilius Varus in this office, is scarcely satisfactory, because it is evident from Josephus (*Ant.*, xvii., 9, § 3; 11, § 1, B. J., ii., 5, etc.), that the latter did not vacate till after the death of Herod the Great, while the ἀπογραφή must have taken place, at any rate at Bethlehem, some time before.

Tertullian indeed states (*Adv. Marc.*, iv., 19) that the census took place when Sentius Saturninus was governor: "Sed et census constat actos sub Augusto nunc in Judæam per Sentium Saturnium, apud quos genus ejus inquirere potuissent;" and Mr. Greswell (*Dissertations upon the Harmony of the Gospels*, p. 478, et seq.) maintains the accuracy of this statement.

Now Justin Martyr three times, in a very positive manner, couples the birth of our Lord with the name of Quirinus. The passages are:—

Apol., i., c. 34. Κώμη (βηθλεέμ) . . . ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ὡς καὶ μαθεῖν δύνασθε ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου, τοῦ ὑμετέρου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πρώτου γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου.

Apol. i., c. 46. Εἰπωσι πρὸ ἐτῶν ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα γεγεννησθαι τὸν Χριστὸν λέγειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου.

Dial. c. Trypho., c. 78. Ἀπογραφῆς οὔσης ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ τότε πρώτης ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου, κ.τ.λ.

In the first of these passages the title of Quirinus is given, viz., ἐπιτρόπος. Does then Justin use this to imply the proprætor of Syria, for which office the usual term was ἀντιστρατηγός? Now at *Ap.* i., c. 13, 40; *Dial. c. Trypho.*, c. 30, we find the term ἐπιτρόπος applied to Pontius Pilate, who certainly was not proprætor. In what sense then was this word used about the beginning of our era? Josephus (*Ant.*, xvii., 9, § 3) calls Sabinus, during the proprætorship of Varus, after Herod's death, Καίσαρος ἐπιτρόπος τῶν ἐν Συρίᾳ πραγμάτων,

and (x., § 1) ἐπιτρόπος τοῦ Καίσαρος (calling Varus ὁ Συρίας στρατηγός); and again (B. J., ii., 2, § 1), ἐπιτρόπος τῆς Συρίας. Again it is applied to Volumnius (B. J., i., 27, § 2), to Pilate (ii., 9, § 2), to Cuspius Fadus (ii., 11, § 6) to a steward of Herod (ii., 2, § 1); and we read (ii., 8, § 1) ἐπίτροπός τις τῆς ἰππικῆς παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις τάξεως Κοπώνιος πέμπεται, μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐξουσίαν; besides other passages which might be quoted if necessary. Again, in Dion Cassius (*Hist.*, liii., 15) we find it said of Augustus, τοὺς ἐπιτρόπους (οὕτω γὰρ τοὺς τὰς τε κοινὰς προσόδους ἐκλέγοντας, καὶ προστεταγμένα σφίσιν ἀναλίσκοντας ὀνομάζομεν) ἐς πάντα ὁμοίως τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ἑαυτοῦ δὲ καὶ τοῦ δήμου, τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἰππέων, τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀπελευθέρων πέμπει· πλὴν καθόσον τοὺς φόρους οἱ ἀνθύπατοι παρ' ὧν ἄρχουσι ἐσπράσσουσι· ἐντολὰς τέ τινας καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτρόποις καὶ τοῖς ἀνθυπάτοις τοῖς τε ἀντιστρατήγοις δίδωσι, ὅπως ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς ἐξίωσι.

It therefore seems probable that Justin Martyr uses the word in its technical sense, and states that our Lord was born when Cyrenius was ἐπιτρόπος in Judæa.

Will, then, the words of St. Luke bear this interpretation? Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη, ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου. This verb ἡγεμονεύω is only used once besides in the New Testament (Luke iii. 1), and there it is of Pontius Pilate. (I take the reading of D ἐπιτροπεύοντος to be the correction of some one who knew that ἐπιτρόπος was Pilate's proper title, and thought that ἡγεμων could not be applied to him.) The word ἡγεμων, however, is not uncommon in the New Testament, occurring twenty-three times, in seventeen of which it is applied to Pilate, Felix, or Festus; and we find ἡγεμονία used to denote the "reign" of Tiberias Cæsar in Luke iii. 1. Now to these and similar officials, Josephus repeatedly applies the term ἐπιτρόπος; and in the case of Coponius, who aided Quirinus in the taxation of A.D. 6, states that he was ἐπιτρόπος. He also calls Festus ἑπαρχος (*Ant.*, xx., 8, § 11, and also *Albinus*, ix., § 1), with extraordinary powers, viz., life and death. That there was such an officer as ἐπιτρόπος τῆς Συρίας about the time of our Lord's birth, is shewn by *Ant.*, xvii., 9, § 3, B. J., ii., 2, § 1, where Sabinus is mentioned by that title in the troubles which

occurred shortly after the death of Herod the Great, during the proprætorship of Varus.

Now (putting the question of inspiration aside), whether is more likely to be precise in the use of a term, Justin Martyr or St. Luke? Surely the former, because he is referring to the records of this enrolment (ὥς καὶ μαθεῖν δύνασθε ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου . . . ἐπιτρόπου) in order to prove the place of our Lord's birth, while the latter merely mentions it incidentally to explain what took Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem. Seeing then that this view is indirectly confirmed by Tertullian (*loc cit*), who also had great reason for being precise and accurate on the occasion, I conclude that the word ἡγεμονεύοντος in St. Luke must not be translated "being governor," or more strictly "proprætor," but simply "being an official or commissioner," *i.e.*, a procurator.

But, it will be asked, why should St. Luke mention Cyrenius the subordinate instead of Saturninus the proprætor? Partly, perhaps, because from the after government of Judæa his countrymen were much more familiar with the idea of the ἐπιτρόπος τῆς Ἰουδαίας who resided in the land, as Pilate or Felix, than with the distant proprætor of Syria, just as I imagine a native of Bombay would mention the governor of that province much more frequently than the governor-general of India; but still more, because that census having been presided over by the ἐπιτρόπος, Quirinus would be naturally associated with his name. That there was an ἀπογραφή, but not a taxing, when our Lord was born, after what Greswell and Zumpt have written, may, I think, be taken for granted (see *esp. Ant.*, xiii. 2, 4; *Prideaux*, ii., 503).

I should then translate St. Luke's words, "This first enrolment took place when Cyrenius was an ἡγέμων of Syria." He does not say of *Judæa*, because there was no ἐπιτρόπος or ἡγέμων to whom that territorial designation could properly be given till after the banishment of Archelaus. The words of Justin Martyr (*Ap.*, i., c. 34) I take to signify, "As you can ascertain from the enrolments which were made under Quirinus, your first procurator in Judæa," and those in the dialogue with Trypho (c. 78), "when there was a census for the first time under

Quirinus.” The well-known taxation when Quirinus was *pro-prætor*, A.D. 6, will fully explain the use of *πρῶτος* by both St. Luke and Justin; and if my conjecture, that he was the *ἐπιτρόπος* who was sent to make the first *enrolment* in B.C. 5-4 be right, we can understand his being appointed *pro-prætor* when the *taxation* was made in A.D. 6. That he was in the East about B.C., Zumpt has shewn to be highly probable.^a

^a After writing the above, I find that Lardner (ii., 248) inclines to the above view, though he appears to have missed the confirmation which, as I have endeavoured to point out above, is given by Justin Martyr.

It is sometimes said, both in attack and defence, that the theology of the nineteenth century is essentially undogmatic. If it be meant by this that it attaches less value than former ages to the peculiar shape which Christian doctrines have assumed in those ages, and that it arranges them in different proportions, this is perfectly true; but that is a characteristic more or less, of every system of theology peculiar to each successive period. If it be said that it attaches less importance altogether to belief than to practice, to the outward expression of belief than to its inward spirit, this is true, and belongs to that most exalted aspect of it of which I have just spoken, and which stamps it with a likeness, however humble and imperfect, to the prophetic spirit of the Old Testament, and the evangelical teaching of the New. The opposite view, namely, of the superior importance of intellectual belief to moral practice, may still linger here and there, but in a very hesitating form. Contrast the ready and unqualified acceptance of the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, three hundred or a thousand years ago, with the extreme reserve with which they are received now by every single clergyman in the Church of England, from its highest dignitary to its humbler curates. But if by calling modern theology undogmatic, it be meant that it is a theology without doctrines, and paying no heed to a proper statement of them, this is the very reverse of the facts of the case. Look only at the vast number of German books on dogmatical theology. The very word “dogmatic,” in this sense, is in fact derived from them. That which modern theology has attempted to do, and in which, if I mistake not, lies its greatest field hereafter, is to penetrate below the letter of words and dogmas to their inmost spirit and meaning.—*Dean Stanley.*

VICARIOUS SUFFERING.*

BY PROFESSOR HERMANN SCHULTZ.

Isaiah lii. 13 to the end, and chap. liii.

WE have here the heart both of the Old and New Testaments. Nowhere else is the relation in which our evangelical faith stands to the faith of pre-Christian times so clearly indicated. The idea of reconciliation, and in association with this the idea of vicarious suffering, runs through the new covenant and the old like a golden thread, bearing testimony to the love of God. And thus a unity is given to the Godward side of the diversified history which the Bible contains, just as a unity is given to the manward side of that history by the doctrine of faith.

Of all Old Testament passages the one now before us penetrates most profoundly the spirit of the New Testament, and sets forth most clearly and precisely the character of the Deliverer, accompanying him on his course from the day when he enters upon his public life as the Lamb which taketh away the sin of the world to the day of his death upon the cross, when, taking the place of the wicked, he was numbered with the transgressors.

We do not propose in the present paper to discuss fully this prophetic passage. We select from it a single point, viz., the doctrine of vicarious suffering. This doctrine forms the essence of the passage, and the essence, too, of the idea of reconciliation. We shall consider the doctrine of vicarious suffering first of all as a *general truth*; and then look at it biblically and theologically as it is affected by this passage from Isaiah.

I.

1. To many the idea of vicarious suffering seems like a contradiction. Suffering appears to belong emphatically to a sphere in which one is least able to take the place of another; this seems to be the point at which we are thrown back most exclusively and undeniably upon ourselves and our own feeling. This

* From the German. The substance of an academical inaugural address delivered in the Aula at Basel, May 6th, 1864.

mode of thinking, however, is a natural result of a forgetfulness of the close relation existing between man and man; a forgetfulness of the common ground in which all personality is rooted. The tendency of a true philosophy, and still more of religion, is to lead us to think of men in a very different manner; to regard them not simply in their separate individuality, but to remember their common origin and their inviolable relation to each other. And both philosophy and religion point us to traces of vicarious suffering in the realm of nature. We see there a divine kingdom in which obedience to law is rendered unconsciously and of necessity; and this obedience to law is intended to be the pattern to which human action shall conform, only such action must be intelligent and voluntary. And in such close connection has God placed these two spheres, that he has even allowed human sin, human death, and human suffering to produce their reflection in "creation," which not of its own free choice, not on its own account, is made subject to vanity (Rom. viii. 20).

If we go to nature, then, in the spirit of Him who taught us to see a type of His kingdom in the growth of plants in the vineyard, and in the seed sown in the field, we find on every hand traces of the suffering of one for another. True, this suffering is not in the strict sense of the term vicarious. It is but the common lot of transitoriness and vanity, which one bears for another without exempting that other. But it is worthy of notice that even here life in every instance comes out of death. The seed corn, must die in order that the fulness of a new life may be produced (John xii. 24). The old life must perish to give nourishment to the new. Everything from the flower to the beast derives life from another's death. And when we look at the higher forms of natural life, including the natural life of man himself, we find that just in proportion to the intensity of that life is the intensity of pain and suffering necessary for its origination and development. The young life comes from an agony of birth, and that agony is used both in the Old and New Testaments as an emblem of the moral struggle in which the life of faith begins. The nurture of the young life involves suffering and sacrifice, and thus the natural life here gives us a glimpse into the higher region. For here the suffering even of

the brute becomes voluntary sacrifice; the loving life, undaunted by privation and distress, is laid down for the beloved one. This instinct of natural love glorifies natural suffering; such suffering becomes an image of that which is moral and spontaneous.

2. We pass on to a yet higher sphere, that of the labour and struggling of humanity; not at present, however, entering upon the special domain of sin and the suffering connected with it; although, indeed, sin and its penalty have left their mark on every department of human activity. Science first arrests our attention as the most striking exhibition of man's contact with nature, and of his intellectual triumph over organized matter. We find here a continually recurring process of vicarious action. The few contend and suffer. They win at the cost of their hearts' blood by the toil of joyless days and restless nights, by unconquerable patience, and in the face of unintelligent opposition, the stock of intellectual wealth. The many receive and enjoy, and rejoice in the light. They accept in faith, so to speak, the work of the few.

Who are the men who have acquired the intellectual wealth upon which our knowledge, our education, and our civilization rest? From time immemorial have they not been those who have devoted their life to labour? They have sacrificed the enjoyments of youth, the rest of age, and the full strength of mature years, and have accepted a lot of danger, privation, opposition, and exhausting toil. We need not mention names. These men live in the memories of all; and not one of them has won what we now enjoy without the hardest struggling and the severest suffering. The heroes of intellect are also its martyrs. The favourites of genius, in whom the glory of the divine spirit of wisdom and knowledge is most grandly manifest, are also the sufferers,—sufferers for their fellow-men. The paths that lead to all that is highest in humanity must be cemented with blood and sweat, otherwise there can be no firm foothold, and the goal must remain unattainable. The struggles and sufferings which issue in the production of the intellectual wealth of men are borne by a few individuals for the race, and, in virtue of the relation existing between man and man, that wealth is shared by all who have receptivity of spirit.

And who, then, are these few? They are the best; those in whom the power of the divine intelligence is most wonderfully manifested, they who for themselves would have had the least necessity to suffer for the sake of these intellectual treasures, for they, by their very constitution, were nearest to the attainment of them. We here perceive one of the characteristics of true vicarious suffering. It must proceed from the best; it must be to as small an extent as possible the result of a personal deficiency; much rather must it be the fruit of personal power. It must spring from a devoted, self-forgetful love for the manifestation of the spirit of God in humanity,—although it may be that this love apprehends only a single aspect of that manifestation, a solitary gleam of the divine light. These are important principles, and should be carefully kept in mind when vicarious suffering is considered in the highest, the all comprehensive sphere of life. What has been said of science applies of course to every department of human labour, art and poetry; political life and civil organizations are dependent upon such heroes of the intellect as those referred to. And these heroes are also martyrs to the causes they espouse. They are so even when worldly fortune and intellectual power are most lavishly bestowed upon them; then, indeed, this is often most true.

The Greek intellect has given fine expression to this truth in the fable of Hercules,—the hero of labour and suffering. And the story of Prometheus itself strikes the key-note of an endless vicarious suffering for the intellectual benefit of men. It is true that in all these instances only the outer edge of the moral life is touched; we are not brought by them into its innermost circle,—to sin and redemption. Nevertheless, we find that here, as well as in the sphere of natural life, vicarious suffering is the fundamental law of the development of our race. Labour and suffering are the purchase-money of the intellectual wealth of civilization; labour and suffering endured by the few, the best, the greatest, the genii of humanity.

3. But the idea of suffering necessarily leads us further,—to the consideration of its relation to sin. In every case suffering has its root in sin, in the disqualification of man to be as he ought to be, the instrument of the spirit of God. Sin is essen-

tially a revolt of nature against the divine authority, and an assumption of the ruling power. It is an exclusion of God and his authority from the heart, and consequently an exclusion of the power of life and joy. And so wherever sin reigns, death and misery with all that they imply must reign. Suffering in its entirety as a diminution of the life of the creature, stands connected with sin.

How, upon the common ground of sin and death,—how, with respect to these considered as a compact unity,—vicarious suffering can find place, we are first taught by revelation; for revelation alone goes beyond the conception of sin as an unavoidable evil, and regards it as an absolute evil.

Taking for granted, then, the connection between sin and death, we will first of all consider them in individual and special instances. And here we can discern vicarious suffering as an universal law. When in certain circles the curse of sin operates in a special manner, it falls almost universally to the lot of friendship, of parental affection, of noble disinterestedness, to take upon itself a part of the suffering which the sin of others has incurred. And this not merely by mental sympathy (although in such sympathy there is a vicarious element), but also by the actual endurance of privation, of contempt, of danger; and this takes away a part of the curse of sin. The apostle even places such suffering for a good man—that is, a man who calls forth personal esteem—in a certain parallel with the sufferings of the Redeemer (Rom. v. 7).

When we take a wider outlook we see that it is sin, degeneracy, the lack of a truly divine power, that ruins states and nations. And what is it that saves them? Is it not the vicarious suffering of the best? These, who are least chargeable with the guilt of sin, give their own welfare, their own safety, their own life, for their fellow men. Like the Roman hero, they cast themselves into the gulf which threatens to swallow up their country, that the gulf may close. This is the history of all true heroes.

Here, then, the idea of vicarious suffering is concentrated and summed up. For, 1st, in this case the vicarious nature of the suffering appears in a clearer light. Here suffering is

endured, not merely to secure to others a benefit, but to spare them the endurance of suffering. Dishonour for dishonour; privation for privation; ruin for ruin. It is death in all its power that is here shared. And, 2ndly, we see here more deeply into the inner growth of such suffering. Here, too, they are the best who suffer; "the true for the untrue; the noble for the ignoble; the best child in the house bearing the burden of the worst;"^b but here Love appears more clearly and plainly as the source of such suffering. It is not simply enthusiasm for art, for science, for wisdom, that here comes into view, although even this is a love for the divine; it is love for the human race regarded as God's children; love which would rather bear the suffering of another than see it; love which forgets self in concern for others.

And here, too, is seen the redemptive power of vicarious suffering. The gulf closes; the curse of sin vanishes out of families and states; men's hearts, laid waste by sin, live again, and suffering becomes a means of their salvation. In love entering into the death of the race, these heroes infuse into that death a share of the life that burns within themselves.

4. Before we pass on to consider the divine and eternal basis of this truth, and before we can understand the divine necessity for the law which we have traced, both in nature and in humanity, we must set aside a notion which has not unfrequently obscured the simple idea of vicarious suffering. Is *vicarious suffering*—suffering caused by the acceptance of the punishment of another's sin—*vicarious punishment*? We must answer this question by an unqualified negative. Indeed, vicarious suffering and punishment are contradictory terms. Punishment requires guilt in the subject of it. Suffering is only punishment to him to whom it is the consequence of departure from God. Vicarious suffering, on the contrary, requires the innocence, at least the relative innocence, of the subject. He alone, as we have seen, is able to take the place of another in suffering who is himself free, as far as possible, from personal participation in the sin which led to such suffering. The suffering of those who suffer vicariously springs from love, there-

^b Lange.

fore from inward affinity to God. We cannot say, then, that the punishment of one is laid upon another. Rather, we ought to say, that the suffering which, for the guilty, was the result of sin, and was therefore punishment, is borne *as suffering*, without being punishment, by the voluntary love of another.^c That which is most opposed to the essence of punishment, viz., voluntary action, self-forgetfulness, the devotedness of love, is most necessary to the essence of vicarious suffering.

It is true that language which does not aim at scientific precision cannot be expected minutely to mark this distinction. "To bear guilt," "to bear punishment," and even "to bear sin," are perfectly justifiable expressions in popular speech ; because, while indicating briefly and enigmatically the idea of vicarious suffering, they need not interfere with a clear and correct conception of what it is.

This applies pre-eminently to the language of the Old Testament, and to that of the New, so far as it is based upon the former. In virtue of the strong sense of the connection between sin and guilt, and between guilt and suffering, entertained by the sacred writers, the expressions which denote sin generally have the signification of sin leading to and producing suffering. The result and the essential occasion of it are closely bound together.^d Accordingly, it need cause no surprise when we meet in Holy Scripture with such expressions as those referred to. Sin can be borne by the innocent neither as guilt nor as punishment, but only as suffering ; although, it is to be remembered, that suffering is necessitated by the righteousness of God, which condemns, and so punishes sinners.

A confusion of these ideas, however, is more likely to mislead when it occurs in dogmatic theology. And yet such confusion has not unfrequently been found in the dogmatic statement of the Christian doctrine of the Atonement, from the time of Anselm of Canterbury up to the present. Ever since Anselm (in his work, *Why did God become Man?*) based the bearing of the penalty of sin by the God-Man upon the insulted honour of God, which required indemnification for the

^c Comp. Deut. xxiv. 16 ; 2 Kings xiv. 6 ; Ezek. xviii. 3, ff.

^d *E. g.* Psalms v. 10 ; xxxviii. 5 ; xxxix. 9, etc.

dishonour done to it by sin, the notion has prevailed, in spite of Abelard's protest, and in spite of the deeper view of German mysticism, that it was in this sense actually guilt, a punishment of sin, which Christ endured. In some instances this arrangement has been regarded, as by Grotius, as an arbitrary judicial act of God, who inflicted the penalty on Christ, in order that he might be able to punish men without destroying them. In other instances, in accordance with the current theology of the Reformers, it has been supposed that the claims of the divine anger having been satisfied in Christ, men have a right to the righteousness of God. In either case, there is a confusion of the ideas of suffering and punishment; and we are indebted to Schleiermacher for having detected the confusion, and for having led the way to a more profound view of this doctrine.

II.

We have found the law of vicarious suffering, then, in the natural and moral world. We cannot now refrain from enquiring concerning the divine basis of this law, for such a law cannot be supposed to be accidental, or to be unassociated with the Divine Being.

But how can vicarious suffering have its basis in the Divine Being? Is not He absolutely blessed,—One to whom the idea of suffering, in the human sense, has no application? Heathenism, indeed, has its suffering gods. From the worship of Adonis, which under a thousand different forms prevailed throughout the East, to the service of Baldur, by the Northern Germans, this thought pervades mythology. This may be, because to heathenism, nature—attaining its highest development in man—is God; and because all mythology is essentially pantheistic, and confuses the idea of God with the development of nature and humanity. But it must be otherwise with respect to the personal God of Christianity, who is holy,—that is, undisturbed by any external force, by any dishonour,—in Himself absolute and intangible!

And yet this idea of suffering has its application even here! Suffering, in the ordinary sense, in the sense of human suffering implying dependence, is impossible with God. He is unre-

stricted, free and holy. Neither can the idea of suffering be associated with God, considered as the divine Father; for as such He is the eternally undisturbed primeval cause, the source and origin of all existence, although not participating in the development of existence.

Perhaps, however, there is, if we may venture upon the expression, a divine suffering which has its origin, not in dependence, but in freedom; not in compulsion, but in love; not in self-surrender, but in holiness. And even in human vicarious suffering, we have already seen traces of such characteristics.

Perhaps, then, we may apprehend the thought of suffering in God, when we regard Him as the Son. For, as the Son, He is continually proceeding from and yet continually one with the Father, and He is the creating, life-giving, and redeeming Deity, —the divine essence proceeding from the eternal first cause; by Him the universe exists and is sustained; in the spirit He is eternally One with the Father.

Let us think, then, of the relation of God to the world; the world that lies before us, a scene of sin, of vanity, of death! Here, the divine life, in itself absolute and happy, comes into constant communication with material forms; that life is thus brought into association with suffering and death. God, in himself, eternally unmoved by suffering or death, eternally inviolable, withdraws Himself from the perishing existences, and communicates Himself to those who live.

But if the Deity in whom we believe is not an epicurean God, but the Father of love, must not such communication with the creature be a continual suffering? Is it not a continual sympathy with the vanity of the creature, a divine participation in the limited and the finite, a voluntary introduction of the pain of the finite into the blessedness of the Deity, without the consequent loss of that blessedness? And is not this a vicarious suffering, by which the creature is preserved from sinking and vanishing into nothingness, a suffering of the Son for the world. Should he take away their breath, they would return unto their dust (Psalm civ. 29; Job xxxiv. 14).

Let us pass on, then, into the sphere of human sin. Sin is a rejection of the Divine love; a closing up of the creature

against the Divine revelation ; and, therefore, sin evokes the reaction of Divine love, the wrath of God.

We must guard against resolving the wrath of God, of which all the Scriptures speak, into a merely natural process, without the accompaniment of any feeling. Ours is a personal God, whose heart is touched whenever His holy and loving will is violated ; and accordingly Scripture speaks of grieving the Holy Spirit (Eph. iv. 30). This being so, God's holy displeasure does not lead to the destruction of the creature. God does not abandon the race which has incurred the penalty of death. He maintains his intercourse with the creature, notwithstanding sin and death. He becomes a Redeemer, and overcomes opposition by love. Christ calls this the perfection of God (Matt. v. 48 ; conf. ver. 44, 45), and the glory of this perfection is seen in His loving death.

In order, then, that men may not die (although death is the penalty of sin), God bears with sin in long suffering. He sends forth his Spirit for the enlightenment of sinful humanity ; he causes him to share human suffering. His heart is affected by the pain of his creatures, for it is filled with love, although moved with anger against sin. His Spirit of life and love is given to diseased humanity to quicken and to heal ; He is given in the suffering of love.

Thus vicarious suffering is the fundamental thought in redemption. The divine and perfectly blessed Being, in His spontaneous love, partakes of the misery of the creature. And we see in God himself, in His relation to a world of sin, the fundamental characteristics of vicarious suffering.

Here, then, we have the key to this mystery ; here we pass directly from vicarious suffering in its relation to single manifestations of sin to its ultimate basis ; we see vicarious suffering in its relation to sin as a whole, and we see it as an act of redemption. From this point we proceed, then, lastly, to the prophetic passage before us, which we have already characterized as the grandest prophetic utterance upon the subject of vicarious suffering (Isaiah lii. 53).

III.

The kernel of the history contained in the Revelation of the divine will consists in the account of the contest with sin, and the working out of redemption. That history begins its account of man with the story of his sin; it reaches its culmination in the utterance, "It is finished;" and it attains its completion in the declaration, "Death is done away." Redemption and reconciliation are its characteristic theme. With whom do we meet, then, first of all, as the representatives of vicarious suffering? We answer, With the Israelitish nation. What men of genius and heroes are in other spheres, that is Israel for humanity in the central sphere of all, the sphere of redemption. Their vocation is one of pain, of isolation, of endurance, of general hatred. As a nation they go through the most painful experiences for the sake of other nations. Their death, their exile, their disgrace bring salvation within the reach of other people. Accordingly our prophet speaks of Israel first of all as the servant of God (Isa. xli. 8 *ff.*). The subjective, the actual worthiness of Israel is not, indeed, here spoken of. It is objectively, with reference to the calling, the election of Israel, that the nation is described as the servant and also as the Son of God. Therein lies the prophetic element of the thought. And so the prophet speaks of the nation as mean and despised (xli. 14), suffering and languishing (ver. 17), plundered and spoiled, snared in holes and prison-houses. They are for a prey and none delivereth, for a spoil and none saith restore (xlii. 22). But the Lord hath called Israel, and given them for a covenant of the people, and for a light of the Gentiles (xlii. 6), and in order that this vocation may be realized, Israel must repent of those sins of which they, in common with other nations, are guilty (lxviii. 8), and be purified in the fires of tribulation. But it was not because they were worse than other nations, that the Israelites suffered beyond all others; but because they stood nearer to God, and because God's spirit was working in them.

Something then of the divine spirit of vicarious suffering is seen in the case of Israel; and yet it is seen here only in a small and imperfect degree. For that which they suffered for

other nations was, at the same time, their own chastisement ; and suffering cannot be, strictly speaking, vicarious when it is the punishment of the sufferer's own fault. Only the personally holy and happy can suffer vicariously, as we saw in connection with the divine idea of such suffering. And so, if Israel is to be regarded as God's servant, who by suffering saves the world, the nation must be regarded prophetically ; the actual Israel must be merged in the ideal ; the nation must be regarded as having realized its calling,—as being sinless.

This prophetic conception of Israel is partially realized in *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα*—the pious part of the people. We see it in individual cases, and in entire orders of men (*e.g.*, the prophetic order), giving throughout the entire history of the nation a glimpse of the divine plan. Similarly, also, we find the term "Son of God" transferred from the entire nation to the house of David, and thus prophetically restricted in its application (2 Sam. vii.). And, indeed, the idea of vicarious suffering presents in this instance another and a diviner aspect. In order that the calling of the nation may be realized,—in order that the actual Israel might not be altogether different from Israel according to the will of God, the best of the nation itself have to suffer and to die. It was so in the earliest times. Joseph is chosen from amongst his brethren,—the best beloved of his father, and by suffering and danger he secures the possibility of Israel's salvation. Moses, the man of God, interposes his life for the life of Israel, his happiness for Israel's welfare,—and he who was plagued more than any man, bore, as typically the high priest, Israel's burden upon his heart. Most strikingly, however, is the idea of vicarious suffering seen in the case of the pious at the time of the fall of the kingdom. Of these Jeremiah may be regarded as the type. Their sufferings are twofold, although for themselves they would not have had to suffer at all. In their love, instead of selfishly turning away from the lost nation, they identify themselves with the Israelitish people, and share their death. They act thus, so that in Israel there may remain the germ of a holy future. And in addition to this death, which they felt most severely, because they regarded it as the fruit of sin and the token of divine displeasure,

they have to endure from the people of Israel themselves contempt, persecution, and danger (Jer. xx. 6 *ff.*). In this their case was like that of the Redeemer, bearing the penalty of sin, and traduced by those whom He died to redeem.

Thus the best of the Israelites suffer and die, that the nation may not die. They suffer and die out of love for Israel, and for that salvation of humanity which was to come forth from this nation. And as the sufferer Job prays for pardon for those friends who reviled him (Job xlii. 8), so these best men of Israel pray in the pangs of death for the people who persecute them. It is in chap. xlix. that the title "servant of God" rises into this higher significance. He of whom it is there said that he is destined to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel (ver. 6), cannot be the nation of Israel itself. The servant of God is no more the actual Israel, whose sins had been set forth in chap. xlviii.; this is the ideal Israel,—Israel as represented in the person of men of God, Israel as it lived in the prophet's heart. And so the prophet speaks as from his own heart.

But even here the idea of vicarious suffering does not find its complete realization; for, in the first place, there is here only a relative sinlessness. Even Moses appears not altogether without sin (Numb. xx. 22). Even Job was conscious of youthful sins, for which he repents (Job xiii. 26). But when vicarious suffering is to be set over against sin as a whole,—when it is to procure redemption, in the divine sense,—there must be in the subject of such suffering absolute freedom from sin. In this case, too, the love from which vicarious suffering springs must not merely embrace a particular race of men, such as Israel; that love must, without personal interest, such as is implied in love to members of the same family, embrace all humanity as created for God, and for God's sake. He who possesses such love, although exempt, as God, from the power of death, must, as a member of the race which has become subject to death, share that death in the power of redeeming love,—not ceasing to be blessed, but on that very account seeking after no blessedness nor rest which would involve his separating himself from his brethren.

And, further, in this sphere no exceptional human strength, no single communication of the power of the divine love and wisdom, can suffice. We stand here in the very centre of humanity. Only He who is willing lovingly to merge himself in the complete humanity, and who can apprehend the entire sin of the human race, and feel the suffering it produces,—only He can truly suffer vicariously in this case.

For this, however, the entire strength of the divine love and holy devotion must be possessed. Not a mere solitary gift of the Spirit; not a being filled with the Holy Ghost, such as we read of in the course of the history of redemption! No; a complete communication of the Deity, in all his power of love, and in all his holiness, is here necessary. Vicarious suffering for the sin of humanity requires a God-man. Only by such an One can the suffering which is the penalty of the entire sin of humanity be borne vicariously,—so that faith in the fruit of this suffering may free the individual from guilt. Only when vicarious suffering is endured by such an One, as a participation in the afflictions of humanity, can it bring back to men the germ of an imperishable life.

And here we remark, it must be an entrance of the *Son* of God into humanity; for it is in Him that the universal law of vicarious suffering is perfectly exemplified. The Church has rightly repelled the doctrine of the Patripassians, who thought that God the Father suffered vicariously. For should we conceive of such suffering not in the Deity communicating himself in spontaneous love, but in the Deity as the eternal First Cause, this suffering would then be the result of necessity, not of freedom,—a suffering in connection with which the idea of the divine happiness and holiness would be lost, as it is with the heathen.

Thus, we see Israel as the “servant of God,” the true Israel, prophetically pointing to a vicarious suffering in an absolute sense; and the Old Testament idea of the “Son of God” presses us on necessarily to the highest conception of the Messiah. The titles indicate a suffering in which, to us who occupy the standpoint of the New Testament, perfect freedom from sin, perfect sympathy with God, and a central position in relation

to humanity, appear as conditions ; a suffering necessitated by, and bearing witness to, the holiness of God, and his absolute opposition to sin, and constituting the most essential manifestation of the divine love. It is only necessary to mention that this vicarious suffering can be none other than the suffering of death ; the suffering of that which sin entails as its consequence and penalty.

If we find in Isaiah lii. 13, and liii. a prophetic description of such suffering,^c we by no means wish to assert that the prophet here points to a single future Personage—a God-man—and His loving death, with all the clearness with which these are presented to us, who see the fulfilment of the prophecy. We must not forget the difference between prophecy and its fulfilment. The Man of Sorrows, in whom we instantly recognize the features of our Saviour, was not so distinctly seen by Israel.

By the “servant of God,” then, the prophet means, first of all, as we have already seen, Israel considered in relation to the divine choice. But as the wickedness of the Israelitish people becomes more fully developed, the phrase becomes restricted in its application to the ideal, the spiritual Israel, to whom was given a mission of salvation to the whole nation.

This spiritual Israel, represented at the time of the captivity by such men as Jeremiah, lies at the basis of the prophecy before us. But now the gaze of the prophet is directed to the final period. The subject treated of is the last step in the course of redemption. This Israel is prophetically seen in the far-off time, winning the last victory, enduring the last decisive sufferings, attaining the triumph of love in the death of the Loving One. At first this Israel of the future is presented to the mind of the prophet simply as a personification ; but then, unable to resist the force of a living and personal vision, the prophet perceives a living and human person ; for the representation of death and burial and resurrection will no longer bear the universality of the abstract (liii. 7, etc.)

Thus, the Righteous One of the future, who is to suffer for the sins of men, stands before the eye of the prophet ; not, indeed, with the distinctness of prescience, but with the clearness

^c Zech. xii. 10 ff. is the only parallel Old Testament passage.

given by prophetic faith, and becomes to us, who have seen the fulfilment of the prophecy (a fulfilment infinitely more glorious than the prophecy), a heavenly Guiding Star. And this is the Servant of God—the despised One—exposed to every insult, given up to death and humiliation for our sakes; in the measureless patience of divine love bearing the burden of human suffering, in order to realize Israel's calling, and take away the sin of the world.

Thus the spirit of vicarious suffering comes forth from God, and has become incarnate in Christ; and in all who have the Spirit of Christ this spirit must work, the spirit of divine, vicarious, and redeeming suffering and love (Col. i. 24).

Anointing.—The first instance of *anointing* which the Scriptures record is that of Aaron, when he was solemnly set apart to the high priesthood. Being first invested with the rich robes of his high office, the sacred oil was poured in much profusion upon his head. It is from this that the high priest, as well as the king, is called “the Anointed” (Lev. iv. 3, 5, 16; vi. 20; Psalm cxxxiii. 2). In fact, anointing being the principal ceremony of regal inauguration among the Jews, as crowning is with us; “anointing,” as applied to a king, has much the same signification as “crowned.” It does not, however, appear that this anointing was repeated at every succession, the anointing of the founder of the dynasty being considered efficient for its purpose as long as the regular line of descent was undisturbed; hence we find no instance of unction as a sign of investiture in the royal authority, except in the case of Saul, the first king of the Jews, and of David, the first of his line; and, subsequently, in those of Solomon and Joash, who both ascended the throne under circumstances in which there was danger that their right might be forcibly disputed (1 Sam. x. 1; 2 Sam. ii. 4; v. 1—3; 2 Kings xi. 12; 1 Chron. xi. 1—3; 2 Chron. xxiii. 11). Those who were inducted into the royal office in the kingdom of Israel appear to have been inaugurated with some peculiar ceremonies (2 Kings ix. 13). But it is not clear that they were anointed at all; and the omission (if real) is ascribed by the Jewish writers to the want of the holy anointing oil, which could alone be used on such occasions, and which was in the keeping of the priests of the Temple in Jerusalem.—Kitto's *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*.

JOHANNES HUS REDIVIVUS.

EXACTLY 450 years after John Huss was bound to the stake, and committed to the flames, and his ashes cast into the Rhine at Constance, the first instalment of his works in the Bohemian language appeared at Prague, the capital of his native country. Many of these have never before been printed, and we shall now be able to know him, not merely as a controversialist, writing and speaking in the Latin language, but as a man living, acting, and speaking among those of his own nation and his own language. I propose to give below the preface of Mr. Karel Jaromir Erben, the learned and careful editor of the Bohemian remains of Huss, Huss's own preface to his *Postilla*, or popular sermons, and a specimen of the sermons themselves, literally translated from the original.

K. J. ERBEN'S PREFACE TO VOL. I. OF THE BOHEMIAN WORKS OF JOHN HUSS.

“Very different judgments are passed upon both John Huss himself and his religious influence by persons of different parties, and a certain class of people in our day endeavours to conceal the truth, and obtain currency for perverse explanations, relying on the circumstance that there is no one who can ascertain the truth at the very fountain head, and thus detect their falsehoods. Hence a critical edition of the writings of this man, who was so conspicuous above others in European history, appears to be the more necessary, in order that his real aim, his real line of thought, and his real spirit may thence be ascertained. The collected Latin writings of Huss were published partly at Nuremberg in 1715, and partly at Vienna in 1856, but some of them still remain in manuscript, while others, especially those in the Viennese collection, require to be re-edited with greater correctness. But we, at the present time, are especially interested in the writings, letters, and other productions of the mind of Huss, which were written in the Bohemian or Czechish language, that they may now come to light for the first time in a more complete collection. Some of them, it is true, have been printed, viz., the *Postilla*, at Nuremberg in 1563 and

1592, and elsewhere, singly, but these old editions are now excessively scarce, and, besides, to a great extent incorrect, containing many variations from the original text, caused by conforming the language to that current in their day; nay, there are among them things which are incorrectly ascribed to Huss.

“ Besides the historical interest above mentioned, the Bohemian writings of Huss have no little philological importance. Huss was not only the reformer of Bohemian orthography, but also a reformer of the Bohemian language; nay, a new period begins with him in our older literature.

“ In this edition we have paid diligent attention to both these sides of the question,—the historical and the philological. Only such things have been admitted into this collection as can be satisfactorily ascertained to have proceeded from the pen of Huss. As regards the sources of the edition, precedence has been given to the oldest manuscripts as compared with the later ones, and use has only been made of the oldest printed copies in cases in which there are no older manuscripts in existence.”

* * * *

[Here follow observations on the orthography, etc., which will not interest an English reader.]

“ In this collection, we take first the longest and, at the same time, most important writings of the Master who perished at the stake, *i.e.*, the ‘Exposition of the Faith,’ etc., then the treatise on Simony, and in the second volume, the *Postilla*; the remaining shorter writings, letters, and poems will follow in the third volume.

“ A fuller account of the writings of Huss, of the chronological order in which they were written, and of the sources of this edition, will be appended to the third volume.

“ *Prague, April 30th, 1865.*”

“ K. J. E.

JOHN HUSS’S PREFACE TO HIS “POSTILLA;” OR, “EXPOSITION OF
THE HOLY SUNDAY GOSPELS.”^a

“ Our merciful Saviour, the Lord Almighty, the Son of God, Jesus Christ, very God and very Man, came into the world to

^a These correspond to a great extent, but not entirely, to our Gospels.

bear witness to the truth, to preach concerning the kingdom of heaven, to collect strayed sheep, and to shew them by word and deed the path to everlasting happiness, therein fulfilling the will of his Father, the Lord God. In humility, in stillness, and in poverty, rejected by the proud and by the prudent of this world, especially by the bishops, the masters, the priests, and the lawyers, who always opposed him, did our merciful Saviour work with the people by preaching until his death; and this he did out of great compassion. Therefore writes St. Matthew in the ninth chapter, saying: 'Jesus, seeing the multitudes, had compassion on them, because they were troubled, and lay like sheep, having no shepherd. Therefore he said to his disciples: The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest.' That is to say: there are many people who would gladly hear the word of God, and thus come, like wheat, into the garner of the kingdom of Christ; but the labourers are few, that is to say, there are few faithful preachers, who work from love with the people of God for the glory of God, for the salvation of the people and for their own. Therefore saith the Saviour: 'Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that is, God, who is Lord of the whole world, that he will send faithful labourers into his harvest.' This expression, 'The harvest is plenteous and the labourers are few,' is considered by St. Gregory, who says: 'This we cannot utter without grievous sorrow, for although there are those who would gladly hear good things, yet there are none to tell them. Yes, the world is full of priests, and yet very few labourers are found in God's harvest; for we receive the office of the priesthood, but do not in deed fulfil our office. But consider, my brethren, consider what the Lord says: "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that he will send labourers into his harvest!" Pray ye for us, that we may be able to prepare things beneficial for you, that our tongue may not cease from exhortation; and that, as we have undertaken the office of preaching, our silence may not condemn us before our righteous judge.' Thus far St. Gregory. Considering his words, or rather those of my Saviour, in order not to neglect my priestly office and waste my time, I have determined, with God's help, briefly

to explain all the Sunday Gospels, for the praise of God and the salvation of faithful Bohemians, who wish to know and fulfil the will of God, desiring that those who read or hear may be saved, may preserve themselves from sins, may love God above all things, may hold fast love towards one another, may make progress in virtues, and may entreat the Lord God for me, a sinner.

“And as people do not usually possess the Gospels written in the Bohemian language, and as an exposition is not so easily received without a previous foundation, I therefore intend to place the Gospel first, and the exposition afterwards, that the word of our Saviour may sound forth most loudly, and thus be made known to the faithful for their salvation: for whosoever hear it in love until death, the same shall be saved, and are blessed in this world, as the Saviour himself saith: ‘Blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it’ (Luke xi. 20). Considering this, we ought diligently, lovingly, stedfastly, and cheerfully to listen to the words of our merciful Saviour, to tell and preach them to others, to guide them to the understanding thereof, and explain one passage of Scripture in accordance with another, as the saints by the gift of God explain them. My intention is, so far as I am able, to explain the Gospels in the manner easiest to be understood, and not in my usual manner of preaching.”

“GOSPEL FOR THE FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.—Matt. xxi. 1—9.

“The subject matter of this Gospel actually occurred on Palm Sunday, and therefore it is more suitably commemorated on that day than on the present day. Still we read it to-day, commemorating His coming, which the Christian Church commemorates to-day; the Bohemians using the term ‘advent’ according to the Latin language; for the Latin ‘adventus’ corresponds to the Bohemian words for ‘coming’ or ‘visit.’ This the Holy Church commemorates from to-day until the day of Christ’s nativity; and thus this whole space is called ‘advent,’ that is, the time during which Christ’s visit is commemorated.

“Know then that Christ’s visit is threefold, as the Scripture proves. Firstly, in the body. In that he visited us, when, being God, he became incarnate in the Virgin Mary’s womb.

Of this he speaks himself in the sixteenth chapter of St. John :
'I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world.'

"The second visit of Christ is spiritual, in which he visits us by his grace, for he saith : 'If any man loves me, he keeps my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him.' This is the meaning of Christ, that He and the Father will come to that man who loves Christ, and keeps his word. And of this visit he speaks in the Revelation of St. John, in the third chapter : 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock ; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.' At the door doth Christ stand, so that he is ready with gracious will to visit each man, and he knocks, when he warns him by inspiration, by pain, by threatening, or by sickness, or by the giving of various gifts. And whosoever listens to the voice of his command, forsaking sin, and fully turning his will to good, to this man doth Christ enter in, visiting him by his grace ; and if the man ends his life in that grace without returning to sin, then Christ will sup with him and he with Christ, that is, he will enjoy everlasting happiness. And in this way, too, doth Christ visit a man spiritually, when he forsakes deadly sins, and He forgives him them, and when he grants him his special grace, and when at the hour of death he comes to him by his grace. Likewise, too, he visits evil men by threatening, by vengeance, and by everlasting destruction, and that especially at the hour of death. Therefore he saith, in the twenty-fourth chapter of St. Matthew : 'Watch, for ye know not at what hour your Lord cometh.' And in the third chapter of the Revelation of St. John he saith : 'If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee.'

"The third visit of Christ is future, at the day of judgment, concerning which he speaks himself in the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew : 'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all his angels with him, then will he sit on the throne of his kingdom, and all people will be gathered before him.' Concerning this coming also we say in the Creed, that he will come to judge the quick and the dead.

"Hence, then, thou hast furthermore, that his first visit took

place once for all, when once for all he became incarnate; that the second is taking place every day, as every day he visits the faithful by his grace, and the evil by vengeance or by warning; and that the third is yet to come. For his first visit we ought to be very grateful, and thus to commemorate it lovingly; with regard to his second visit we ought to be diligent, that it may please him to abide with us, and to conduct ourselves devoutly, that he may visit us with especial grace on the day of his nativity; with regard to the third, we ought to be in very diligent expectation, for he commands to watch very diligently, that is, to keep from sin and advance in the grace of God. And on account of these three visits the Holy Church has ordained, that from this day forth we should improve ourselves in the practice of virtue more diligently than before, remembering, that by his incarnation he came for our salvation, and that by his grace he especially visits us on the day of his nativity, and that for the third time he will come in the judgment day, and will give us an everlasting kingdom.

“And for this visit the preparation is threefold: firstly, that the faithful, expecting their Lord, should conduct themselves reverently, and that especially when he is approaching. And this rests upon that saying of the holy Isaiah in the first chapter, ‘Cease to do evil, learn to do good.’ And as David saith, ‘Refrain from evil and do good.’ The second preparation is, that when we hear that so great a Lord is nigh, we should prepare ourselves, and that in three ways: firstly, by preparing for him a house, that is, by cleansing the soul from sins; for he saith through Isaiah in the first chapter: ‘Wash you, and make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes.’ Secondly, we ought to prepare ourselves in a beautiful garment, as Isaiah says in the fifty-second chapter: ‘Put on thy beautiful garment, O Jerusalem, holy city!’ Jerusalem in this place signifies the congregation of the faithful, which is the holy city, in which Christ is to abide as King for ever; and this city ought to dress itself in a garment of gloriousness, that is, in virtue, which makes a man glorious. And this garment is immeasurably better to every soul than all the garments of this world with which the body adorns itself, nay, virtue alone

adorns a man better than any bodily garment ; and this garment ought to be white, that is, unspotted by sin. Thirdly, we ought to make preparations to provide meat suitable for so great a Lord. The suitable meat, which Christ eats, is the fulfilment of his will, as he saith himself in the fourth chapter of St. John : ‘ My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.’ And again he saith : ‘ Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you.’ Those provide themselves with the meat that perisheth not who fulfil the will of God, and abide therein, for they will live in everlasting happiness for ever. And thus it is that faithful Christians nourish Christ every day, when they fulfil his commandments. And this he will himself acknowledge on the judgment day, when he says to the righteous : ‘ I was hungry, and ye gave me meat ; thirsty, and ye gave me drink.’ Yes, thus ought we to prepare ourselves to commemorate properly his first holy visit, to make ourselves ready for his second and third visits, and thus worthily receive his holy body on the day of his divine nativity. For Saint Augustine says in a sermon : ‘ Dearly beloved brethren ! by the grace of God days have come to us, in which we desire to celebrate the divine nativity ; therefore I entreat and exhort that we labour in the best way we are able, in order that on that day we may be able to approach the altar of God with a clean conscience, with great diligence, and with a clean heart and body, and may be worthy to receive his body and blood, not to judgment, but to the healing of the soul and to our salvation. For our life lies in Christ’s body, as he himself saith : ‘ Unless ye eat the body of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.’ Therefore let him change his life who wishes to receive life ; for if he change not his life, he receives life unto judgment, and is more injured thereby than quickened. O, how happy is that soul that, by God’s help, has so framed its life that it is worthy to receive the consecrated symbol^b of Christ ! Again, how unhappy and miserable is that conscience which by evil deeds has so defiled itself, that Christ will not abide in it, but the devil begins to rule it !’ All this says St. Augustine.

^b Literally “ host ” (hosti).

“From all these words, as St. Paul also commands us in the Epistle for to-day, let us obtain instruction: ‘Let us cast off the works of darkness,’ that is, let us free ourselves from sins, which lead to everlasting darkness, and let us ‘put on the armour of light,’ that is, let us take up virtues which will lead us to everlasting light. For if we thus live, we shall commemorate properly the threefold visit of Christ; we shall be suitable objects for him to visit with his especial grace now, afterwards at the hour of death, and finally at the judgment day. Already has he visited us by his incarnation; we commemorate that visit as having already taken place. He has also visited us by his grace in baptism, in that he freed us from our sins; and, though we have sinned after baptism, still he has visited us by his grace in repentance; if then any have not sinned mortally after baptism, he has visited them by especial grace, and doth visit them. And of his third visit at the judgment day we are in expectation, expecting which we ought to be always in readiness, for he himself saith: ‘Be ye ready, for the Son of Man cometh at an hour when ye think not.’ And we ought to be so in readiness, as to suffer lovingly whatever happens to us for the sake of our beloved Christ, even as he for us sinners, for his adversaries, without being bound thereto, suffered lovingly a cruel death; for which death he came voluntarily to Jerusalem, and rode in upon a young ass with great weeping, exhibiting his gracious visit to the people of Jerusalem.

“Therefore this Gospel is read to-day concerning the spiritual visit wherewith he has visited the faithful by his holy passion; not in order to take from them their property, nor to make them proud, but to redeem them from death, and give them an everlasting kingdom. Therefore the holy Zechariah prophecies, saying to the Holy Church: ‘Behold thy King cometh to thee, righteous and a Saviour: he is poor, and riding upon an ass and a colt, the foal of an ass.’ In this saying, the prophet comforts the Holy Church, saying, ‘Behold thy king,’ a king gracious as regards vengeance, mighty as regards protection, wise to govern, rich to recompense. He says, ‘Thy king,’ in that he created thee; thine, in that he quickens thee; thine, in that he defends thee from the devil; thine, in that he has redeemed thee from

death ; thine, in that he has loved thee unto death ; thine, in that he will give thee an everlasting kingdom, if, finally, thou wilt but be thankful. Therefore he saith : Behold thy king cometh, or rideth up to thee, 'righteous,' in that he will give to each according to his desert : a 'Saviour,' for he came to save, as he said himself : 'So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life ; for God sent not his Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world through him might be saved.'

“Lo ! now thou hast his testimony, that he was sent by the Father into this world, not to judge the world, but to save the world, that is, the people chosen for salvation out of the world ; for these he will not sentence to everlasting destruction. Therefore saith the prophet to the Holy Church : 'Behold thy king cometh to thee righteous, and a Saviour ; and 'he is poor,' that he may enrich thee with that poverty, as St. Paul saith : 'Christ was made poor for our sakes, that we, through his poverty, might become rich' (2 Cor. viii. 9), that is to say, now in virtues and hereafter in heavenly bliss ; for this was the reason why he came poor, riding on a young ass, as the Gospel testifies ; a thing which I do not intend to explain now, for it seems to me better to keep it for Palm Sunday, for at that time it happened, and not to prolong my discourse now.

“Therefore, dearly beloved, let this suffice, and prepare yourselves for his second and third visits, by lamenting your sins, making progress in virtues, fulfilling penitence, and heartily longing for his visits.”

I trust that the above will contribute in some measure towards drawing the attention of the countrymen of Wicklef, the “Master of deep thoughts” (*Mistr hlubokych smyslów*), to the poor and struggling nation that formerly produced his disciple Huss, and successfully defended Scriptural truth and Christ's ordinance against the whole power of the Germano-Roman empire, wielded by the wearer of the triple crown in the city upon seven hills.

A. H. WRATISLAW.

JOHN THE PRESBYTER.*

By PROFESSOR MILLIGAN, D.D.

THE questions relating to the existence of this John, and the particulars connected with him ; who he was ? what position he filled ? and what work he did ? are questions to which, from the very scantiness and obscurity of the materials for deciding them, there is, and always will be, a strange pleasure in returning. And this would be the case, although no issue of any moment whatever depended upon the result at which we might arrive. Enough, if we can only persuade ourselves that we have helped to solve a riddle by which others have been perplexed, that we have been able to hold fast the slender thread that guides us through the intricacies of the labyrinth, when it has so often broken in the hands of others. More, however, is dependent upon the answer to be given to the questions proposed above with regard to John the Presbyter. That person plays a part in history hardly less famous, certainly infinitely more important, than his Asiatic namesake many centuries later. He meets us in some of the most difficult and interesting enquiries connected with our canonical Gospels, as in those relating to the original language and first structure of St. Matthew, and to the origin and first structure of St. Mark, while he has lately appeared upon the stage, in the work of M. Nicolas, as the author of the Gospel of St. John. It may be well, therefore, to ask a little more particularly after him, more especially as we hope to give our readers reason to believe that what has been asserted by some, hinted at by others, is most probably true ; that such a man as "John the Presbyter" is alleged to have never had any distinct existence.

It is in an extract from the writings of Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, in the early part of the second century, that we are introduced to John the Presbyter. The extract,

* Since this article was in the hands of the printers, the writer has been informed that a course of reasoning in some points similar has been pursued by Zahn, in an article in the *Studien u. Kritiken* for 1866. If it be so, for he has not seen the article, the fact may be accepted as in some degree confirmatory of the conclusions here come to.

which is given by Eusebius, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, book iii., c. xxxix., is to the following effect:—"For I shall not regret to give you along with my interpretations whatsoever things I long ago was fortunate enough to learn and to commit to memory from the Presbyters, giving you positive assurance of the truth concerning them. For I had no pleasure, like the most of men, in listening to those who speak much, but I delighted rather in the teachers of the truth; nor did I care for those who record precepts coming from foreign sources, but rather for those who could tell me of the precepts given by the Lord to faith, and that issued from the truth itself. But if any one who had been a companion of the Presbyters came to me,^b I used to ask what the words of the Presbyters had been, what Andrew or Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas, or James, or what John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples, also what Aristion and John the Presbyter, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not think that I got so much profit from the things contained in books, as from the things delivered by the living and abiding voice." The above passage is quoted by Eusebius, from Papias's introduction to his work, *λογιῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*; and it is quoted for the sake, among other objects, of shewing that Irenæus, from whom the historian had immediately before taken a certain statement about Papias, was wrong in what he said. Irenæus had declared that Papias had been a hearer of John the apostle and a companion of Polycarp. No, says Eusebius, Irenæus is falsely informed upon that point, for if we attend to the language of Papias himself, we shall find that he was not a hearer of the holy apostles, but only of those who had been acquainted with them; and then he gives the extract above quoted.

Having given the extract, Eusebius proceeds to reason on it. "Here," he says, "it is proper to observe, that he twice mentions the name of John, reckoning the first of the two along with Peter, and James, and Matthew, and the other apostles, and thus clearly shewing that he refers to the evangelist. But then, drawing a distinction as to the other John, he assigns to him another place beyond the number of those who were

^b Εἰ δὲ ποῦ καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις, κ.τ.λ.

apostles, and he distinctly calls him presbyter. It would seem then that these things confirm the truth of the story told by those who inform us that there were two of the same name in Asia, and that there were two tombs in Ephesus, each of which is still called the tomb of John. It is most necessary to pay attention to this, for it is likely that the second, unless we allow that it was, as some would have it, the first, beheld the revelation which is ascribed to John." Such is the statement of Eusebius. His argument is obviously founded simply upon the language of Papias. He has no knowledge from any other quarter of a second John. He has heard, indeed, a story about two tombs at Ephesus, each belonging to a John, and he thinks that that story receives confirmation from the fact that, according to Papias, there were two Johns, the one the Apostle, the other the Presbyter. It is important to observe this, for had Eusebius professed to know anything independently of John the Presbyter, his evidence would be entitled to very different weight from what, we shall see, actually belongs to it. As it is, we occupy the same ground with him. We have a passage of Papias before us, and the question is simply, What is the correct interpretation of it?

Certainly, the first impression made on us is that Eusebius is right. Papias does seem to speak of two distinct persons, each bearing the name of John, the one ranked with the apostles named, the other placed in a different category, and even there not holding the first place, but preceded by the mention of Aristion. Yet when we examine the whole passage a little more closely, there is much to shake our faith in the correctness of this view, and of our historian's criticism. For,

(1) In one point evidently Eusebius is wrong. Immediately after the passage last quoted by us he says, "And the same Papias, whom we have just spoken of, testifies that he had received the words of the apostles from those who had companied with them, and says that he had been himself a hearer of Aristion and the Presbyter John."^c This statement must

^c Καὶ ὁ νῦν δὲ ἡμῖν δηλούμενος Παπίας τοὺς μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων λόγους παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῖς παρηκολουθηκότων ὁμολογεῖ παρεληφέναι, Ἀριστίωνος δὲ καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου αὐτήκουν ἑαυτὸν φησὶ γενέσθαι.

have been founded upon the different tenses of *εἶπεν* and *λέγουσιν* in the words of Papias. It is at once clear, however, that whatever that difference implies, a point to which we shall return, it does not imply this conclusion. Papias does not say that he had been acquainted with the companions of the apostles on the one hand, but directly with Aristion and John the Presbyter on the other hand. He speaks of hearsay evidence in both cases. If any one came to him from the apostles, he enquired what they *said*; if any one came to him from Aristion and John the Presbyter, he enquired what they *say*. The true inference is, not that his communications with the apostles, and with Aristion or John the Presbyter, had been different in kind, but that, when companions of the former came to him, they spoke of statements made *in old times*; when companions of the latter came to him, they spoke of statements made *at that time*, a time, therefore, when Aristion and John the Presbyter were alive. It by no means follows from this, however, that Papias had personally known the two last mentioned. He may have done so. He had done so; but he does not tell us that in so many words here, and Eusebius is mistaken when he draws such a conclusion from the Greek. His mistake on one point makes it, at least, more probable that he may be mistaken on others.

That Lange (*Leben Jesu*, i., p. 152), and Riggensbach (*Vorlesungen über das Leben des Herrn Jesu*, p. 62) have failed to notice this, and that they too make Papias say that he had had personal intercourse with Aristion and the Presbyter, probably arises from the not unnatural idea that the statement of Irenæus, with regard to Papias's acquaintance with the apostle John, was founded upon *this particular passage* of the writings of the Phrygian bishop. Hence, they seem to have concluded that the passage bore testimony to a personal acquaintance with a John, and that the only question was, Who may he be? Carefully looked at, however, the passage does not appear to bear any such testimony. It speaks of personal acquaintance with no John, and Irenæus must have drawn his information from some other source.

(2) Let us now look more narrowly at the words in question. It will at once be observed then, that under the word *πρεσβυ-*

τέρων, we must understand the apostles to be referred to. These Presbyters, as a class, are immediately resolved into Andrew, Philip, Peter, etc. But in the very next clause, ὁ πρεσβύτερος is the epithet applied to our supposed second John. How extremely improbable that the word should be used this second time in a sense different from what it bore the first! How hopeless the confusion into which we must be thrown if language is to be so incorrectly employed! Schneider, indeed (*Die Aechtheit des Johan. Evang.*, p. 15), maintains that no difficulty is thus presented, if we only understand πρεσβύτερος not in the strict sense of apostle, but in the wider and looser one of elder, ancient. But this method of escape from the difficulty is hardly satisfactory; for, in the first place, τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, followed by the specific names of apostles, and apostles alone, naturally leads us to think of them, to think of a more definite meaning than that of the patriarchs of the Christian community; and, in the second place, if John the Presbyter was not John the Apostle, he could hardly, in the eyes of Papias, be a patriarch at all. He must rather have been a contemporary of his own. The man who had been a companion of Polycarp must have been quite as much a πρεσβύτερος himself. It is difficult, therefore, to resist the conclusion that, when in the same sentence the apostles, among whom John is distinctly mentioned, are described as Presbyters, and one John the Presbyter is also expressly named, we must believe the two to have been the same. Besides, why is not Aristion also called an elder, a patriarch, if we are to take the word in this more general sense? There can be little doubt that he belonged to the same generation as John the Presbyter. We can explain the omission of πρεσβύτερος before his name, therefore, only when we take that word in a much more specific sense than the sense proposed by Schneider; not, indeed, as directly equivalent to apostles, but as used here with direct reference to them.

Our conclusion, however, is rendered still more probable, if we notice another fact, that both the apostles, and Aristion and the Presbyter, are described in this one sentence as τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί. In applying these words to the former, there can be

no doubt that Papias means to say that they were *immediate* personal disciples of Jesus. That this is implied in the whole context will be at once admitted, and we need not spend time in arguing the point. Again, therefore, it must appear not a little improbable, that the same expression should not, a few words later, have the same meaning.

(3) The difficulty may still seem to remain, and to counter-balance the force of these considerations, that Papias should thus name the same John twice over in the same sentence, classing him on one occasion with the apostles, on the other with Aristion. The difficulty, we confess, would be insuperable were the names connected in both cases with the same kind of statement. But they are not so. The first kind of statement is embodied in *εἶπεν*, the second in *λέγουσιν*. The first is *what had been said*, the second is *what was still said* at the time referred to. In short, Papias has before his eye two stages of apostolic life, from which reports were brought to him. First, there was the stage when his informants had known the apostles Andrew, Philip, Peter, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, and the others, a stage long gone by, and in reference to which, therefore, only a past tense could be used. Secondly, there was the later stage when few of the original witnesses of the Lord's life were alive, but when, his informants coming direct from them, it was fitting to use the present tense. *Now, the apostle John belonged to both stages.* He had given evidence in the days of Andrew, etc. Then to Papias's informants *εἶπεν*. But he had given evidence also when Andrew and the others, except John, were in their graves. Then to Papias's informants *λέγει*. That is the reason why he is twice mentioned, and why he is so expressly called the second time *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*. John was a common name. It might very readily occur to readers that, on this second occasion, they should think of a second John. They might easily make the mistake that Eusebius did make. It may thus be for the very purpose of guarding against this that John, when he is spoken of the second time, is so emphatically designated. Papias would, as it were, say, I have two periods of John's testimony to speak of; one an old one, the other much more recent; let none think that I mean a different man the

second time; it is not any uncertain, unimportant, John I quote, it is John the Presbyter, the disciple of the Lord. Add to this, that there is nothing improbable in the supposition that, in his latter days, after his fellow-apostles were dead, John might have come to be known as specially ὁ πρεσβύτερος, a supposition that would go far to explain the fact that, in the two smaller canonical epistles which, upon such good authority, bear his name, the writer employs this very designation of himself.

But we may be asked, How is all this possible? How could Papias, at any time of his life, *write* of John the Apostle as alive? There seems certainly to be a difficulty here, and Ruggenbach would appear to have felt it when (l. c. p. 61) he throws doubt upon the statement that Papias died so late as A.D. 163, and endeavours to make out that, after all, there is nothing to prevent his having written about the year 100, when John might not yet have died. We shall not deny that this is possible, although it is at least improbable that, at so early a period of his life, Papias should have written a work in five books, for it must be borne in mind that the words we deal with are taken from that work. But our main answer to the difficulty suggested is, that there is nothing in the text requiring us to believe that the apostle John was alive *at the time when Papias wrote*. All that is implied is, that the apostle was alive *at the time when Papias received such accounts of what he said*. Our good bishop is not writing of the present, of the moment when he is actually using his pen; he has transported himself into the past; he has gone back to the days of his youth; and he is living over again those hours in which he had taken so much interest, when he could listen to the living and abiding voices that told him of what Andrew, etc., *said*, of what Aristion and John *say*. Let us observe the tenses throughout the whole passage, ἔμαθον, ἐμνημόνευσα, ἔχαιρον, ἔλθοι, ἀνέκρινον, ὑπελάμβανον. There is nothing but the past before him, and λέγουσιν is not *the present* when he writes, it is *the present of that past*, which he has kept long treasured in his mind. In this point of view there is obviously no difficulty whatever in the supposition that Papias might record sayings of John the Apostle which had reached his ear while the apostle was alive;

and now he is back amidst those old and happy memories ; he sees his informants come to him ; some tell him what John εἶπεν, others, what John λέγει. Thus he is led to use the double tense, and, as John belonged to both periods, to make a double mention of his name. No doubt he mentions Aristion first, when we might naturally expect that the apostle would lead the way. It is not easy to conjecture what may have been the cause of his doing so. Most probably he attached no importance to the order in which he mentions his authorities, just as in the first half of his sentence he begins his enumeration of the apostles with the name of one of whom almost nothing is known.

Upon these grounds, then, we are disposed to believe, that by "John the Presbyter," we are to understand, not the person usually thought of, but John the Apostle ; to believe, in short, that there are not two Johns spoken of by Papias, but one.

Several collateral considerations may be mentioned which are, at least in no small degree, confirmatory of this conclusion.

(1.) It is to be noticed that the statement of Irenæus, which called forth the criticism of Eusebius, is not, to all appearance, founded upon the extract from Papias that the historian gives. It is an entirely independent statement. "To these things," says Irenæus, "Papias, a hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp, an old writer, bears witness," etc. Then, *to disprove this*, Eusebius quotes the passage already presented by us in full. Irenæus's statement, therefore, must rest upon its own merits, and it is exceedingly definite. He calls Papias a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, who, as we know from the striking and often-quoted description given in Eusebius (*E. H.*, v. 20), was a hearer of John also. Irenæus had himself been a disciple of Polycarp. More direct evidence upon any point it would surely be difficult to find ; and it is evidence that the bishop of Hierapolis has been a hearer of John the Apostle. It cannot fail to be seen how much such a statement is in harmony with the fact mentioned in the passage we have considered at length, that, while the apostle was still alive, Papias used to ask information from those who had seen him as to what he said. And this information, given us by Irenæus, is con-

firmed from other sources. Schneider (l. c., p. 13) quotes the language of Apollinarius of Hierapolis about A.D. 170, and a successor, therefore, of Papias in his see, where he refers to his predecessor as *Παπίας ὁ Ἰωάννου μαθητής*, and even Eusebius himself is said by the same writer to speak, in another of his works, of Papias and Polycarp as distinguished hearers of the apostle, *ἀκουσταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐγνωρίζοντο*. Jerome, too, although he interprets the passage from Papias in Eusebius in the same way as the historian does, distinctly speaks of the writer as a hearer of the evangelist, Papias Joannis Auditor (*De Vir. Illustribus*, Migne's ed., vol. ii., p. 638).

(2.) We are not without evidence that Eusebius was anxious to believe that John the Presbyter and John the Apostle were not the same. It is well known that he had doubts about the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, yet he could hardly resist the singularly firm tradition of the Church upon the point. Here, however, seemed a happy outlet from his difficulties. There were two Johns at Ephesus, John the Apostle and John the Presbyter; how easy must it have been for men to confound the two; the latter, and not the former, may have written this strange book. It is an object with him then to prove this point, as far at least as he can do so, by specious conjectures and possibilities. He comes biassed to the enquiry now before us. Indeed, it is exceedingly doubtful whether the idea of the two Johns was his own at all, or whether he had not hastily adopted it as suitable to his purpose. In the seventh book of his history, c. xxv., he gives us a long extract from Dionysius of Alexandria, in which that Father not only makes mention of the two graves at Ephesus, each supposed to be that of John, but throws out the hint adopted by Eusebius that one of these Johns, not the apostle, may have written the Apocalypse, "since also they say that there were two tombs at Ephesus, and that each was said to be that of John," etc., *καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου λέγεσθαι*. These are almost the very words of Eusebius. It is plain that he took them from Dionysius, and that, sharing the doubts of that Father with regard to the authorship of the Apocalypse, he eagerly caught at the explanation which the idea of the two Johns seemed to suggest.

(3.) What has now been said will become still more evident if we notice that the connecting of the second tomb at Ephesus with John the Presbyter, is one of those little, almost unconscious, embellishments which one who has an end to gain, is so exceedingly apt to make to any story that is at least so far suitable to his purpose. Dionysius had not said anything about that. He had spoken only of John, not the apostle, who might be the author of the Apocalypse, but he has not a word of John the Presbyter. Eusebius, however, reads what he has said; with what he has read upon his mind he turns to Papias; in his work he finds a John at Ephesus spoken of different from the apostle; he says to himself, Dionysius did not know of this; he only threw out a conjecture as to different Johns; but here is the very man; this is the second John of whom tradition speaks. Now we are not blaming Eusebius for unconsciously adding his little help to the old story. We say only, how natural was it that a man in such a state of mind should be somewhat hasty in his conclusions; that when the passage from Papias, easily capable of being rendered as he does render it, met his eye, the wish as to its meaning should be father to the thought. But we must, on that very account, be somewhat more cautious in receiving his criticism than we might otherwise have been.

(4.) If there were such a man as John the Presbyter different from John the Apostle, how comes it that we know so little of him? Eusebius does not learn from Dionysius a word of *his* existence. The latter says only that, just as many Christians were wont to name themselves after Paul and Peter, so he is of opinion that there would be many of the name of John. Nor does the former learn anything of him from any other quarter; his whole argument is drawn from the words of Papias. It does not seem either that any other person has a word to say of him. There is indeed a John spoken of in the Apostolic Constitutions as set by the Apostle over the Ephesian Church; but it is justly remarked by Ruggenbach (l. c., p. 60) that there is no reason to think that this was our Presbyter, for even were that statement more trustworthy than it is, the word *πρεσβύτερος* is evidently used by Papias without the least reference to office. Jerome, no doubt, makes a hesitating allusion to the Presbyter, but in such

a way as rather to confirm than dispel our doubts as to his existence. In his treatise, *De Viris Illustribus*, he thus speaks: "Cujus (Johannis Presbyteri) et hodie alterum sepulchrum apud Ephesum ostenditur, etsi nonnulli putant duas memorias Johannis Evangelistæ esse" (*Opera*, Migne's edition, ii., p. 625). These words shew us that even the tradition of the two tombs being those of two separate Johns had not satisfied Jerome of the existence of both. He evidently thinks, and, in thinking so, he is probably right, that the real meaning of the tradition is, that there were two tombs at Ephesus, *each of which* was claimed as the tomb of the Apostle. It was not that one was assigned to the Evangelist, the other to the Presbyter; but that both were spoken of as the Evangelist's, the one by some persons, the other by others.

It cannot be said in answer to all this that, if we know little of John the Presbyter, we know just as little of Aristion. That is true; but Aristion was a much less important personage than the Presbyter, if the latter existed at all. For we see that Dionysius and Eusebius were disposed to consider the latter the author of the Apocalypse, and Jerome says that some were inclined to ascribe to him the two smaller epistles that bear the name of John. Ignorance of any circumstances connected with him is, therefore, more a matter of surprise than ignorance of anything connected with Aristion; and, coupled with what has been said of the apparent meaning of the words of Papias, contributes to strengthen our conclusion, and to make it probable that no such man ever existed.

Upon the whole, then, we seem entitled to conclude that John the Presbyter is no other than John the Apostle; that the words of Papias do not speak of any immediate communication with him, but of mediate communication having reference to two different periods of his life; that he was still alive when Papias was grown to manhood; and that there is nothing improbable in the statement of Irenæus, made upon authority not given us, that Papias had been a companion of Polycarp, and a hearer of the Apostle.^d

^d Might it not even be said that we have the assurance of Papias himself

It is possible that the course of reasoning we have pursued may leave many still unconvinced that our conclusion is justified by the evidence before us. We may, nevertheless, be permitted to assume for a moment that it is correct, and to examine briefly, in the light of such an assumption, some of the critical questions to which the statements of Papias have given rise. The doing so can hardly fail even in itself to be of interest; and it is possible that, looking at our conclusion simply in the light of a hypothesis, we may find some confirmation of its truth from the manner in which it aids us in the solution of what are otherwise dark, if not insoluble, problems.

1. Proceeding, therefore, upon the idea that "The Presbyter" is no other than the Apostle, we have at once an explanation of the importance attached by Papias to his testimony. *Καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε*; the statement to be made is, to the writer's mind, conclusive upon the point; it is a statement of authority; one to all appearance proceeding from the Presbyter himself, and not merely repeated by him from the lips of another. But if "The Presbyter" belonged to a later generation than the Apostle, if the *λέγουσιν* which we have examined is to be interpreted as significant of the time when Papias wrote, and not of a time long gone by that he was calling to mind, we seem entitled to say that this second-hand evidence would not have answered the writer's purpose. It may be quite true that he was ready to receive stories from every quarter, but he did so because they contained accounts of what the first witnesses had said; and when he gave them currency, it can hardly be doubted that it was because he regarded them as stories which rested, not so much upon the authority of the transmitter, as upon that of the contemporary of the Lord from whom they originally came. It must be particularly noticed that Papias, with all his supposed gossiping tendencies, cares little for the words

that he had known immediate disciples of Jesus? Let our readers note the use of *καὶ* before *παρηκολουθηκώς* in the extract first given by us (note *b*, p. 107); and does not that word, introducing the statement about *mediate* information, naturally lead to the inference that the intercourse spoken of in the words preceding had been *immediate*? Viewed thus, it both confirms our view about John the Presbyter, and our reference of the words following, to *reported* statements in the case of Aristion and the Presbyter, as well as in the case of Andrew, etc.

of disciples of the Apostles considered in themselves; they have value to him only in so far as they lead him backwards to an apostolic source. Now it is clear, from the expression above quoted by us, that the words of the Presbyter himself are valuable and conclusive in the eyes of Papias; and if so, it is much more natural to think that he refers, under that designation, to an apostle, than to one who belonged to another and a later generation.

2. We have an immediate and satisfactory solution of the difficulty by which enquirers into the origin of our canonical Gospels have been so much perplexed, that Papias, in his *ἐξηγήσεις*, should either have made no mention of St. John or of his Gospel, or that, if he had done so, Eusebius should not have thought it worth his while to refer to it. For, as to the first of these points, we have, on the supposition before us, not only a reference to St. John in the words under consideration, but we learn from other expressions of Eusebius that there were many such references in the work from which he quotes. In one passage he speaks of a "frequent" (*πολλάκις*) mention of the name of John, as well as of *παραδόσεις* flowing from him which were to be found in the writings of the Phrygian bishop. In another passage he refers again to these "traditions," only directing those who were interested in them to the work itself for the information that they desired. This, then, is what we should expect would be the case. It is certainly possible that Papias had not preserved any "traditions" dependent upon the authority of St. John; that his Presbyter is a different person, but it is a little strange if it were so. Hierapolis was not very far distant from Ephesus, where there is every reason to believe the Evangelist spent the closing portion of his life,—the acknowledged and honoured head of the Asiatic Church. Much that he had to tell of the wonderful time when he followed the Lord must have been in circulation throughout all the district, and we can hardly imagine that so diligent a collector of traditions as Papias was should have failed to include some of these in his narratives. Even if it were so, however, it may be said these traditions cannot have had any reference to the Gospel of St. John, or Eusebius would have added them to what he has

preserved of the Presbyter's statements with regard to St. Matthew and St. Mark. We are not bound to recognize the justness of this inference. Eusebius may have had reasons of his own for selecting only what he does; but let us allow that there was nothing bearing upon the composition of the Gospel of St. John in the words of the Presbyter; this is more easily explained on the supposition that that Presbyter was John himself than that he was one of his disciples. In the latter case, such a disciple would have been extremely likely to say something of the composition of a Gospel to which all must have attached so much importance. In the former case, the silence of the apostle himself upon a point of the kind is extremely natural; his work was there, it could speak for itself.

As to the second of the two points above referred to, we can also thus at once explain why Eusebius, who is particular in embodying in his history what he had found in the work of Papias regarding the first and second Gospels, should give us no traditional information regarding the fourth. The usual explanations given upon this point by those who believe in the authenticity of St. John's Gospel, and we are not now dealing with those who doubt it, have always appeared to us unsatisfactory. It were better, and at the same time enough, to say that we have no means of explaining it. But if the Presbyter were the Apostle, the reason of Eusebius's silence is at least more obvious than before. There was probably no information to be given. The Presbyter might have spoken of the Apostle, but the Apostle was not so likely to have spoken of himself. Nor let us forget here how strictly this harmonizes with the singular reticence regarding himself which is so marked a characteristic of St. John's composition of his Gospel.

3. The belief that in "the Presbyter" we have the Apostle is in accordance with the idea that St. John was acquainted with the Gospels which had preceded his, or with at least two out of the three. It is well known that this was the uniform opinion of Christian antiquity. It is an opinion confirmed, if not even completely established, by all the most able and recent critical students of St. John's Gospel. No doubt rests on the mind of any enquirer, whose enquiries are worth mentioning, that it was

so ; and the opinion will be at once illustrated and confirmed if the conclusions of this paper are correct.

4. More, however, may be said, for it is at least worthy of notice, that the latest enquiries upon this point lead to the conclusion that the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, that is, the two regarding which "The Presbyter" is quoted by Papias as giving information, were also the two especially before the eyes of St. John in the composition of his own Gospel. This somewhat singular fact is brought out without the least reference to, or thought of, our present enquiry in the recent able and important work of Weizäcker, *Discussions on the Gospel History*. It is indeed impossible to accept all the statements of that work upon the point, but it is not to be denied that some of the references to these Gospels, supposed to betray themselves in the Gospel of St. John, are in a high degree probable. To present them to our readers would occupy too much space, nor is it necessary to do so. Let it suffice to say, that, as regards St. Matthew, they are found chiefly in the discourses of Jesus, recorded by that evangelist ; as regards St. Mark, in the incidents mentioned in his narratives, and in his use of rare and peculiar words which again meet us in St. John ; and that Weizäcker concludes his review of the coincidences which he has noticed with the following statement, which is at once enough for our present purpose, and for shewing that these coincidences are mentioned by him with an entirely different object in view from that with which we are now occupied :—"If we are not able to produce equally sure traces of a use of the Gospel of Luke, the relation which we have shewn subsists between it (the Gospel of John) and the two first Gospels is sufficient to prove that it must be assigned to the close of the first century" (p. 291). Those who can persuade themselves that Weizäcker has even in the main proved his point, will hardly fail to see in it a remarkable confirmation of the inference, that the Presbyter who, in the extracts from Papias, speaks as he does of the first two Gospels, but says nothing of the third, was in all probability no other than the apostle John himself.

5. Another fact, lending probability to our hypothesis, because fully and clearly explained by it, is to be found in the

account which "the Presbyter" is represented by Papias as having given of the composition of the Gospel of St. Mark. All students are acquainted with the difficulty occasioned by the *οὐ μέντοι τάξει* of that account, and with the degree to which such language has been thought to lend probability to the supposition, that our present second Gospel must have been the extended form of one much more fragmentary in its original state. These words, it is argued, cannot apply to our present Mark, which has as distinct and definite a *τάξις* as any of the other Gospels. Looked at, however, from what we know must have been St. John's point of view, no words could be more strictly applicable to the Gospel of St. Mark. The fourth evangelist's *τάξις* is altogether different. In his account of the ministry of Jesus, before the imprisonment and death of the Baptist, in his records of the Judæan ministry, in his description of the Saviour's visits to Jerusalem at several of the great feasts, St. John presents to us a history of Christ in quite another arrangement of details than that of St. Mark. Whatever, therefore, we may think, he at least could not have allowed that there was a *τάξις* in the Gospel of his fellow evangelist. And with this conclusion, entirely independent traditions of Christian antiquity agree. Thus it was that the idea was early entertained, that St. John's special object in the composition of his Gospel was to supply information regarding that period of our Lord's ministry which had preceded the death of the Baptist. What is this but an echo of the *οὐ μέντοι τάξει* of the Presbyter, an echo of the feeling which prevailed, that the apostle had not been satisfied with the arrangement of the earlier Gospels? To no lips, therefore, could these words be more suitable than to those of our fourth evangelist; they completely correspond to what must have been, to what we have independent tradition leading us to believe were, his sentiments. We know, indeed, that the reason thus assigned for the composition of St. John's Gospel is insufficient to explain the facts, but there is nothing improbable in the supposition that it had, at least, something to do with it, and it strictly corresponds to the circumstances of the case. Further, the statements quoted by Papias regarding St. Mark's Gospel in general have a

peculiar propriety if they come from St. John, for we learn from many passages, especially of the Acts of the Apostles, that no one of the twelve was for a long period so closely associated with St. Peter, and, therefore, also with St. Mark, as he was.

6. Once more, it may be observed, that our conclusion derives a certain, if but small, degree of confirmation from the substance of the statement of the Presbyter regarding the language in which St. Matthew originally wrote his Gospel. It was in the Hebrew tongue he tells us. Now few points connected with the history of our present Gospels can be considered better established than that the Gospel of St. Matthew, which we have in our hands, is not a translation, but an original work. Yet of all the traditions of antiquity, it is impossible to name one more distinctly or constantly maintained than the tradition that St. Matthew originally wrote in the Syro-Chaldaic tongue of Palestine in his day. For this tradition, therefore, it is extremely difficult to account. But if it descended from the Apostle John, it is at once explained. He must have known the facts, and his authority no one would think for an instant of disputing.

These several considerations then, taken together, appear to lend some probability to the hypothesis with which we started. It is not maintained that either they, or the arguments adduced in the first part of this paper, are conclusive upon the point. But they are surely not without weight; and we close our remarks by expressing the hope that they may lead others to prosecute the enquiry further. Insignificant as the question may seem to many, few things will throw more light upon some of the most difficult and important enquiries connected with the origin of our Gospels than a conclusive proof that "The Presbyter John" of Papias was no other than John the Apostle of our Lord.

THE GIANTS AND THE SONS OF GOD.**A CRITICISM UPON GENESIS VI. 1—5.**

1, 2. "And it came to pass that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took to them wives of all which they chose.

3. "And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.

4. "There were giants in the earth *in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.*

5. And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth."

The interpretations given by commentators to the expression "the sons of God," and to the word translated "giants," have partially removed the difficulties of these verses. But there is still so much of unremoved strangeness and obscurity in them, that we cannot but think that their translation may be improved; and, with reference to verse 4, venture to suggest an amendment, which, so far as we can ascertain, has never yet been proposed; but which nevertheless is, we believe, capable of being well sustained. It is only in reference to this verse that we have anything to offer that is strictly new. With respect to the verses that precede it, we adopt interpretations that have already been suggested, but with more or less of deviation. The expression, "the sons of God," for instance, we are disposed to understand as denoting not the descendants of Seth exactly (a frequent interpretation), but God's avowed worshippers, the hitherto professedly or outwardly pious, in general, whether descended from Seth or not; and the "daughters of men," in like manner, as denoting women generally. The interpretation which would restrict the former of these expressions to the descendants of Seth, and the latter to those of Cain, appears open to grave objections. For though it may have been in the family of Seth that piety chiefly flourished, and in that of Cain that impiety prevailed, we

have no warrant for supposing that there existed, in regard to piety, that broad distinction between the two that the restriction supposes.

If these expressions be thus understood, the passage, so far as respects the intercourse of these "sons of God" with the "daughters of men," presents no difficulties, simply telling us that in the days preceding the deluge, those who, in virtue of their real or seeming piety, had hitherto borne that high designation, becoming ensnared by the beauty of the women of the time, polygamy prevailed to such an extent, that they took to themselves an unlimited number of wives, even "*wives of all whom they chose.*" The chief difficulty, then, that yet remains to be removed is verse 4. "*There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them, the same became mighty men, which were of old, men of renown.*" This is a verse that has perplexed us for years. Its difficulties, so far at least as our conception of them is concerned, consist not so much, we think, in the declaration that there were "*giants in the earth in those days,*" as in the general haziness of the verse, of its concluding portion more especially. In attempting its elucidation, the word *Nephilim*—the word translated *giants*—demands our first attention. For several reasons we should prefer to leave this word untranslated; partly because its meaning is very uncertain; but chiefly because—so far as the passage as a whole is concerned—a correct conception of its very meaning is not of much importance. It is not a word of frequent occurrence. It occurs only here and in Numb. xiii. 33, where the spies who had been sent by Moses to search the land of Canaan, preparatory to the attempt to take possession of the same, report, "We are not able to go up against the people [of this land], for they are stronger than we. All the people that we saw in it are men of great stature. And there we saw the Nephilim, the sons of Anak." There can be little doubt, however, from the connection in which the word is used in this passage from the book of Numbers, that the Nephilim there and here spoken of were, at least for the most part, men of large stature; and could we feel sure that it was as such that they were called Nephilim, the

word *giants* would of course be an appropriate translation. But we do not think that this was the case, and that for two reasons. In the first place, the idea conveyed by our word *giant* is, in every other instance, expressed in Hebrew by a different word—*Rapha*—a word which occurs in no less than twenty-two separate passages. Our second reason is, that there is nothing in the etymology of the word that would lead one to suppose such to be its signification. So far as its etymology is concerned, it would seem rather to be a word expressive of some moral characteristic, or of some customary course of action, than as designating superiority of stature. It has accordingly (its root being *Naphal*, to fall) been by many translated *apostates* (*i. e.*, men who had *fallen away* from the fear and worship of God); and by perhaps as many more, *assaulters*, as being men who fell upon and assaulted others; as being, in short, men of lawless and predatory habits. Plausible reasons have been advanced in support of each of these suppositions; but as the correctness of neither of them can be decisively proved, it would, we think, be better to let the word remain untranslated, especially as its very meaning is not essential to a general understanding of the two passages in which alone it is found.

Seeing that by the flood the whole human race perished, with the exception of Noah and his family, the very fact that there were Nephilim both before and after the flood is a clear proof that they were not a race, but a class. And since the Nephilim of the book of Numbers were men of great stature, and men of great physical strength, and since, in rude ages and in unsettled times, we universally find that the more robust invariably oppress, or plunder, or hold in subjection, those that are physically inferior to them, the probability is that the Nephilim, whether of Genesis or of Numbers, were men who, being physically and in appearance men of great stature and of great bodily strength, made use of their superiority in these respects to plunder and oppress their fellows; and that it is with special reference to their outrages and oppressions that a subsequent verse tells us that the whole earth was “filled with violence.” Respecting these Nephilim we have only to add, that in the Hebrew they are spoken of as *the* Nephilim, an article being prefixed which our trans-

lators, in their translation of the passage before us, have omitted, as if it were a mere expletive that might be retained or rejected at pleasure. As, however, its being prefixed seems to denote that these Nephilim, whoever they were, were men who, by tradition at least, were well known when this portion of the book of Genesis was written, we prefer to retain it.

The verse, as ordinarily translated, then goes on to tell us,—
“And also, *after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them, the same became mighty men, which were of old, men of renown.*” In attempting the elucidation of this somewhat confused statement, our first enquiry is, Who were they who are here spoken of as “the same?” Were they the children that were born of these marriages? or were they those who are previously spoken of as the sons of God? The common supposition is that they were the former; and such (as the verse is translated in our authorized version) would seem to be the obvious and natural meaning of the words. But it must be borne in mind that the word “children” is a supplemented word. A mere English reader may see this for himself, by noticing that in the English translation of the verse it is printed in italics—to indicate that it is not in the original—though of course implied. The strict translation of this portion of the verse is simply, “and they bare to them.” Grammatically, therefore, the words “the same” appear rather to refer to the sons of God, who, going in unto the daughters of men, begat the children, than to the children themselves.

Upon the supposition that such is their reference, the obscurity of the verse is already very much removed. A change in the punctuation of the words that follow, in which we are told of those who are spoken of as “the same,” that they “became mighty men, which were of old, men of renown,” will tend to its yet further elucidation. By placing a comma after the words “which were of old,” and thereby separating them from the words which follow, our translators clearly understood these words as asserting of those that are here spoken of as “the same,” three things:—1st, that they became mighty men; 2nd, that they were of old; and 3rd, that they were, or became, men of renown. But as the

original is not punctuated, we have as much right, if the sense requires it, to omit the comma as to insert it. Omit it, and the verse reads thus, making not three separate assertions, but only one, viz., that “the same became mighty men, *who hitherto* (this being the sense in which we understand the words ‘of old’) *had been men of renown.*” In other words, that the polygamous marriages of these hitherto righteous men, these sons of God, acted injuriously upon their character, causing those who had hitherto been sons of God and men of renown, to aspire to be and to become, instead thereof, men of mere power—“mighty men.”

Of course, in themselves considered, the words “mighty men” imply nothing as to moral character. But when used in such a connection as that in which we here find them, when we are told that men who had borne the high designation of being sons of God, and of being men of renown, giving way to the self-indulgence of unbridled polygamous intercourse, took to themselves “wives of *all* whom they chose,” and became men of might, or mighty men, it does seem as if the words were intended to denote deterioration of character. Especially have we reason for so thinking when it is immediately added, as if to express that their becoming such indicated such deterioration—“and God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth.”

The only remaining cause of obscurity is the punctuation and translation of the Hebrew expression וגם אחר-כן אשר “and also after that, when,” etc., a translation and punctuation by which that which is asserted of the sons of God, in verse 4, is inconsistently represented as being *subsequent to* itself. (See verse 2.)

“When” (in one single word) would, we believe, more correctly express the meaning of the Hebrew; as in Deut. xxiv. 4, “He may not take her again *after-when* (*i. e., when*) she is defiled;” and as in Josh. ii. 7, “*And after-that-when* (*i. e., And when*) they which pursued after them were gone out, they shut the gate.”

Thus translated and thus explained, the whole verse reads as follows :^a—

^a We subjoin the Authorized Version, italicising those portions of it from which we deviate, and bracketing the supplemented words.

“The Nephilim (whom we may suppose to have been a well-known and daringly wicked class of men, whatever may have been the precise nature of their wickedness) were in the earth in those days; *and also, when* the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare to them, *the same* (i. e., they also, the sons of God, the hitherto righteous,) *became men of might, who heretofore had been men of renown.* And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth.”

There were Giants in the earth in those days: *and also after that, when* the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men and they bare [children] to them, *the same* [became] *mighty men which* [were] *of old, men of renown.* And God saw, etc.

The statement of the passage then is simply this:—That there were two causes that moved God to punish the wickedness of men; the one, the existence (and, as we may fairly assume, the wickedness) of the Nephilim; the other, the apostacy and altered character of those who hitherto had been men of good renown, and had borne the high designation of “Sons of God.” Thus understood, it no longer relates a mere marvel, as in the common translation, “And there were Giants in the earth in those days,” etc., but records a solemn fact; telling us that in those days the earth was so filled with violence that even those who had been sons of God and men of good repute, ended by becoming, like the rest of men, men of violence and might.

J. C. K.

THE BOOK OF JOB.—A Revised Translation.

BY THE REV. J. M. RODWELL, M.A.

(Continued from Vol. I. (Fifth Series), p. 422.)

CHAPTER XXII. 26—XXIII. 7.

For then shalt thou delight thyself in Shaddai,
And shalt lift up thy face to Eloah ;
Thou shalt pray to Him, and He shall hear thee,
And thy votive offerings thou shalt pay ;
Thou shalt decide a matter, and it shall be stablished for
thee,
And brightness shall gleam upon thy ways ;
When men humble themselves thou dost promise lifting up,
And He shall succour those of downcast eyes ;
And him who is not guiltless shall He deliver,—
By the pureness of thy hands shall he be delivered.

Then answered Job and said :

To-day too is my complaint bitterness,
Heavier than my groaning is my stroke !
Oh that I knew where I might find Him !
That I might come to His abiding-place !
I would set out my cause before Him,
And fill my mouth *with* pleadings ;
I should know the words He would answer me,
And understand what He would say to me.
Would He contend with me in *the* greatness of *His* strength ?
No, but He would give heed to me ;
There might *the* upright dispute with Him,
And I should escape for ever from my judge.

CHAPTER XXIII. 8—XXIV. 3.

Lo, I go forward,^{*} but He is not *there*,
And backward, but perceive Him not!

On the left hand where He is working, but I cannot see
Him,
Where He veils Himself *on the* right, but I cannot behold
Him!

Surely He knows the way I take;
When He has tried me, I shall come forth as gold.

My foot hath held to His tracks;
His way have I kept, nor turned aside—

The behest of His lips,—and have not gone back;
More than my own resolves, have I laid up *the* words of
His mouth.

But sole is He, and who can turn Him back?
And *what* His soul willed has He done;

For that which is decreed for me will He perform,
And many such things are ordained by Him;[†]

Therefore in His presence am I troubled,—
When I consider, I am afraid of Him;

For *it is* El *who* has made faint my heart,
And *it is* Shaddai *who* has troubled me,

Because I was not cut off before *such* darkness,
And *because* He has *not* hidden *such* gloom from my sight.

Why are events[‡] not hidden from Shaddai?
And *why do* they who know Him, not see His days?[‡]

Some remove landmarks;
Seize upon a flock, and pasture it;

They drive away the ass of the fatherless,
The widow's ox they take in pledge;

^{*} Some understand *forward*, *backward*, etc., of the four quarters of the heavens.

[†] Heb., *are with Him*.

[‡] Heb., *times*.

[‡] Of retribution.

CHAPTER XXIV. 4—15.

They turn aside *the* needy from *the* way,
The poor of *the* land are made to hide themselves altogether.
 Lo, they go forth, like wild-asses in the desert, to their
 work,

Seeking diligently for food;—
The desert *their* children's bread!^u

They reap fodder for him in the field,
 And gather *the* wicked man's vintage;

Naked they pass the night, unclad,
 And without a covering in the cold;

They are wet with mountain showers,
 And for lack of shelter embrace *the* rock;

(*The wicked* snatch *the* fatherless from *the* breast,
 And take in pledge *what is* on *the* poor);

They go naked without clothing,
 And *though* hungry *must* bear *the* sheaves;

They press out oil within their walls,^r
 They tread the wine vats, and are athirst;

From out *the* city men are groaning,
 And *the* soul of *the* wounded cries out—
 Yet Eloah regards not *the* impiety;^v

They are of those who rebel against *the* light,
 Its ways they know not,
 And they abide not in its paths.

At dawn the murderer rises,
 He slays *the* poor and needy,
 And in the night he is as a thief;

The eye also of *the* adulterer watches for twilight,
 Saying, "No eye shall see me;"
 And he puts a covering on *his* face;

^u i. e., it must yield them food.

^r i. e., of the wicked.

^v Or *imputes not the wrong*; or, as Syr., etc., *heeds not their prayer*.

CHAPTER XXIV. 16—XXV. 2.

He breaks through houses in the darkness;—
 By day they seal themselves up—
 They love^a not *the* light:
 For to all of them is morning like death-shade!
 For *each* feels terrors of death-shade!
 He *is* light, *as if* on the surface of waters,^a
 Their portion is cursed in the land,
 He turns not *by the* way of *the* vineyards;
 As drought and heat make spoil of snow-waters,
 So Sheol, *those who* have sinned;
The womb shall forget him,
The worm feeds sweetly on him;
 He shall no more be remembered,
 And wickedness shall be broken like a tree.
 He devours *the* barren who bear not,
 And does not good to *the* widow;
 And he drags off *the* mighty by his power,—
 He uprises, and no man is sure of life.
 God has given him security, and he leans *on it*;^b
 But His eyes are on their way!
 They are exalted a little, then are not, and are brought low,
 They die^c like all *beside*,
 And are cut off like topmost ears.
 But, if it be not so, who will prove me untrue,
 Or make my words nought?

Then answered Bildad the Shuchite and said:

Rule and terribleness are with Him,
 Author of peace in His lofty places!

^a Heb., *know*; i. e., are intimate with.

^a i. e., *swift*, like things borne upon a rapid torrent.

^b Lit., *and He gives to him for security that he may lean*.

^c Lit., *are gathered*, i. e., to their fathers. So Gesenius, or with Fuerst, *are drawn up*, i. e., die.

CHAPTER XXV. 3—XXVI. 10.

Is there *any* number to His hosts?
And on whom uprises not His light?
How then shall frail-man be just with El?
And how *the* woman-born be pure?
Behold even to *the* moon, and it shines not,^d
And *the* stars are not pure in His eyes!
How much less frail-man, a worm,
And *the* son of man, a reptile.

Then answered Job and said :

Wherein hast thou helped the powerless?
Brought safety to *the* feeble arm?
In what hast thou counselled *the* unwise,
And abundantly imparted sense?
To whom hast thou addressed *these* discourses?
And whose spirit has come forth from thee?
The shades tremble—
The waters beneath and their inmates^e—
Sheol *is* bare before Him,
And *there is* no covering to Abaddon!
He stretches out *the* North over *the* void,
He hangs *the* earth on nought:—
He binds up waters in His clouds,
And *the* cloud is not burst under them:—
He shuts up^f *the* face of His throne,
He spreads over it His cloud!
He has graven a circle upon *the* surface of *the* waters,
Where light ends in darkness:^g—

^d Thus Sept., Jer., Chald., etc., or, *and he pitches not his tent (in it)*; or, with some of the Rabbins, *and she will not pitch her tent*, i. e., remain in the heavens.

^e Bildad had spoken (chap. xxv. 5) of God's power in high places. Job carries the subject further, and declares that it reaches to the world of spirits.

^f Lit., *holds back*.

^g Lit., *completion of light with darkness*.

CHAPTER XXVI. 11—XXVII. 10.

Heaven's pillars tremble,
 And are amazed at His rebuke:—
 By His power he hushes^k the sea,
 And by His skill He smites *its* pride!
 By His spirit He has decked *the* Heavens,
 His hand has formed *the* fleet serpent;ⁱ
 Lo, these are outskirts of His ways!
 And how slight a whisper^j has been heard of Him!
 But *the* thunder of His power who can understand?

Then Job again took up his parable^k and said:

As El lives, *who* has deprived me of my *fair* judgment,
 And Shaddai, *who* has embittered my soul,
 All the while my breath is in me,
 And Eloah's spirit in my nostrils,
 My lips shall not speak iniquity,
 And my tongue shall not utter deceit.
 Far be it from me to pronounce you right;
 Till I breathe my last, I will not part with my integrity;
 I hold fast my righteousness, and will not let it go;
 My conscience^l reproaches not one of my days.
 May my foe be like *the* wicked,
 And he that rises up against me like *the* impious!
 For what is *the* hope of *the* hypocrite, though he get *him*
 gain,
 When Eloah shall take^m his soul?
 Will El hear his cry,
 When distress comes upon him?
 Can he delight himself in Shaddai,—
 Invoke Eloah at all times?

^k Lit., *terrifies to silence, restrains.*

ⁱ A constellation of that name.

^j Lit., *and what a whisper-word.*

^k *Parable*, in the sense of a *didactic discourse*, or *sententious poem*.

^l Heb., *heart*.

^m Or, *demand*.

CHAPTER XXVII. 11—XXVIII. 1.

I will teach you of the hand of El,
I will not conceal how Shaddai^a deals.

Lo, all of you have seen *it* ;
Why then speak ye thus vainly ?

This is *the* portion of a wicked man with El,^o
And the lot, *which* oppressors shall receive from Shaddai.

If his children be multiplied, *it is* for *the* sword,
And his offspring shall not have their fill of bread ;

His survivors shall be buried at death,
But their widows shall not bewail them :^p

Though he heap up silver like the dust,
And get together clothing as the clay,

He may prepare, but the righteous shall put *it* on,
And *the* innocent shall divide *the* silver.

He builds his house as a moth,
And like a booth which a *vineyard*-keeper makes ;

The rich man lies down, but it is for the last time ;^q—
He opens his eyes, and he is no more ;

Terrors invade him like a flood,
A whirlwind carries him off by night ;

An east-wind catches him up and he is gone,
And like a storm, sweeps him from his place ;

God shoots^r at him, and spares not,
Though he strive to escape His hand.

Men clap their hands at him,
And hiss him from his place.

Surely there is a mine^s for silver ;
And a place for the gold they fine ;

^a Lit., *what (is) with Shaddai*.

^o Kennicott and others suppose, with much reason, that the following eleven verses and all chapter xxviii. were spoken by Zophar.

^p Heb., *weep*.

^q Lit., with the *ó*, *and does nothing more*.

^r Lit., *casts* (i. e., *arrows*) upon him.

^s Lit., *an outlet*.

CHAPTER XXVIII. 2—13.

Iron may be taken from *the* earth,
 And stone be molten into brass;
The miner makes an end of darkness,
 And all its limits he searches out,—
The stone of darkness and death-shadow.
 He sinks a shaft away from dwellings;
 Of him who walks above are they forgotten¹—
 They swing suspended afar from men:
 The entrails of earth, the source of food,²
 Are upturned as if *by* fire;
 Its rocks are the sapphire's bed,
 And *yield* to him lumps of gold:³
 A path, *the* bird of prey knows not,
 Nor has eye of vulture scanned it;
 No proudly *stalking* beast⁴ has trodden it,
 Nor lion passed by upon it.
 He puts forth his hand upon *the* flint-rock,
 He overturns mountains from *their* root;
 He cuts out rivers in the rocks,
 And his eye beholds every precious-thing;
 He binds up rivers so that they drip not,
 And brings forth hidden things to light.
 But Wisdom⁵—whence can she be found?
 And where *the* place of understanding?
 Frail-man knows not her worth,
 For in *the* land of the living she is not found.

¹ Lit., *the forgotten of the foot, they swing*, etc. But the passage may also mean, *unsupported by their feet*.

² Lit., *the earth, from it comes forth bread, and under it (it is) turned up as (by) fire*.

³ Lit., *dusts of gold*; or, *the soil (yields) gold to him*.

⁴ Lit., *the sons of pride* (or possibly, of *bulk, strength*) *have not trodden it*.

⁵ Heb., *the wisdom*. Thus also verse 20.

CHAPTER XXVIII. 14—27.

The deep saith—"She *is* not in me!"
And *the* sea saith—"Not with me!"
Choice-gold^y cannot be given in her stead,
Nor silver be weighed as her price:
She cannot be weighed with gold of Ophir,
With precious onyx and sapphire:
Bright-gold and crystal cannot compare with her,
Nor for vessel of purest-gold *is* her exchange:
Precious-stones^z and diamond shall not be mentioned,
And the possession of Wisdom is beyond pearls:
Topaz of Cush cannot compare with her—
With pure gold she shall not be weighed.
Wisdom then—whence shall she come?
And where *the* place of understanding?
For she is hidden from *the* eyes of all living,
And concealed from *the* fowls of heaven;
Abaddon and Death say,
Only a rumour of her hath reached our ears.^a
Elohim understands her path,
And He is acquainted with her place:
For He can look to *the* ends of the earth,
Can behold under all the heavens,
So *as* to make a weight for *the* wind,—
He meteth *the* waters by measure—
When He made a law for *the* rain
And a way for *the* thunder-flash,^b
Then He beheld and declared her,
He stablished and searched her out—

^y The roots of the four Hebrew words used for gold imply *shut up* or *precious*, *hoarded*, *bright*, and *refined* gold.

^z Heb., *high things*, i. e., high priced. According to the Rabbins *red corals*.

^a Heb., lit., *we have heard a hearing of her with our ears*.

^b Heb., *flash of voices*.

CHAPTER XXVIII. 28—XXIX. 14.

But to man He said, Lo, Fear of Adonai, that is wisdom,
And to turn from evil, understanding.

Then Job again took up his parable, and said :

Would that I were as *in* months of old,
As *in* days when Eloah kept me ;
When His lamp shone upon my head,
And I walked *in* darkness by its light ;
As I was in *the* days of my autumn,^c
When Eloah's favour^d was upon my tent ;
When Shaddai was yet with me,
My children around me !
When my steps were bathed in milk,
And *the* rock poured rivers of oil for me !
When I went along *the* city, to *the* gate,
And set up my seat in *its* broad-way ;
Youths saw me and hid themselves,
And old men rose,—stood up !
Princes restrained *their* words,
And laid hand upon their mouth !
As for *the* voice of nobles—they hid themselves,
And their tongue cleaved to their palate !
For *the* ear *which* heard of *me*, pronounced me blessed,
And *the* eye *that* saw me, bare me witness,
Because I delivered *the* distressed who cried,
And *the* fatherless who had none to help him ;
The blessing of *the* perishing came upon me,
And I caused *the* widow's heart to sing for joy ;
I clad me in righteousness, and it clothed me,
Like robe and turban was my rectitude ;

^c That is, Youth. The new year began in the autumn.

^d Lit., *familiar converse*.

CHAPTER XXIX. 15—XXX. 2.

Eyes was I to the blind,
And feet *was* I to the lame ;
A father *was* I to the poor,
And I searched out *the* cause of *him* I knew not ;
And I brake *the* jaw-teeth of *the* wicked,
And from his teeth did I pluck *the* prey.
And I said, “ I shall die in^e my nest,
And shall multiply days, as the sand ;^f
“ My root *is* open to *the* waters,
And *the* dew lies all night on my branch,
“ My glory *will be* fresh with me,
And my bow in my hand renew *its strength*.”
Men heard me and waited *for me*,
Were silent at my counsel ;
After my words, they said no more,
And my speech distilled upon them ;
And they waited for me as *for* rain,
And opened their mouth *as* for latter showers.
If I laughed towards them, they believed *me* not,
And *the* light of my countenance they cast not down ;
I chose out their ways and sat as head,
And dwelt like a king among a host,
Like one who comforts mourners.^g
But now do they deride me
Who are short of myself in days ;
Whose sires I did not deign
To place with *the* dogs of my flock !
Of what *avail* to me too, the strength of their hands ?
To them *their* vigour has perished !

^e Heb., *with*.

^f Or, *phoenix*, according to the Rabbins.

^g That is, Occupying a raised seat, and surrounded by mourners seated on the ground. This custom still obtains among the Jews.

CHAPTER XXX. 3—15.

Lean through want and famine,
Reduced to gnaw the desert,^h
The land of gloom, waste, and desolation;
 Who pluck salt-wort at *the* bush,—
 And root of *the* broom, their bread!
 They are driven forth from *the* midst,
 Men shout at them as *after* a thief;
They have to dwell in horrid vallies,
 In caverns of *the* earth and rocks;
 They bray among thickets,
 Are huddled together under nettles;
 Sons of *the* impious, yea, sons of *the* nameless,
 They were scourged forth from the land!
 But now have I become their song,
 And am a by-word to them;
 They loathe me—keep afar from me,
 Nor withhold spittle before my face!
 For they let loose the reinⁱ and insult me,
 And take, in my presence, unbridled licence;
 On the right uprises a brood of them—they trip my feet,^j—
 And they cast up against me their destructive highways;^k
 They break up my path,
 They help on my hurt,
 Though none would aid them;
 They come on as *by* a wide breach,
 They roll themselves along beneath *the* ruins!
 Terrors assail me^l—
 They chase my prosperity like a storm blast,
 So that my welfare has passed like a cloud.

^h Or, *fleeing into the desert.*

ⁱ Lit., *my rein*, i. e., the tie of reverence due to me, and cast off bridle before me.

^j Lit., *they send, thrust away.*

^k That is, Military causeways, as if to besiege.

^l Lit., *are turned upon me.*

CHAPTER XXX. 16—28.

And now my soul pours itself out within me,
 Days of misery take hold upon me;
 By night my bones are pierced within me,
 And my gnawing pains^m rest not;
 Through its great strength it is changed *into* a raiment to
 me,ⁿ
 It girds me like *the* collar of my tunic;
 On *the* mire has He cast me down,
 And I am become like dust and ashes.
 I cry to Thee, but Thou answerest me not,
 I take my stand *before Thee*,^o but Thou heedest *not*;
 Thou art changed into a cruel one to me,
 With *the* might of Thy hand Thou attackest me;
 Thou hast taken me up—hast made me ride on *the* blast,
 And causest *my* safety to melt away;
 For I know that to death Thou wilt return me,
 Even to *the* house of assembly for all living;
 Yet a prayer^p is vain when He puts forth His hand,
 When they cry aloud in His^q calamity.
 Have I not wept with him whose day is hard?
 Has not my soul been grieved for *the* needy?
 Yea, I waited for good, but evil came,
 And I expected light, but there came darkness;
 My bowels boil and are unquiet,
 Days of misery have come in haste upon me;
 Dark-*skinned*, but not from sun-heat, I walk along;^r
 I stand up—I cry aloud in the assembly;

^m Heb., *gnawers*.

ⁿ Thus Schultens and Gesenius in *Thes.*; al., *my skin is changed*.

^o For prayer. ^p i. e., for death and the grave.

^q That is, Inflicted by Him. These two lines may also be rendered;—
 Yet, *when there is prayer for them* He will not stretch forth *His* hand,
 When there is a cry for them in His calamity.

^r Or, *I go mourning without (the) sun*, i. e., in darkness.

CHAPTER XXX. 29—XXXI. 12.

I have become a brother of jackals,
And a companion to *the* daughters of *the* ostrich ;
My skin is black and falls away,^{*}
And my bones are burnt up with heat ;
And my harp is changed to mourning,
And my pipe, to *the* voice of them that weep !

I made a covenant with mine eyes,
How then could I think upon a maiden ?
Yet what a lot *is mine* of Eloah from above,
And what an inheritance by Shaddai from on high !
Is not calamity for *the* wicked,
And misfortune[†] for doers of evil ?
Does He not behold my ways,
And number all my steps ?
If I have walked with vanity,
Or my foot has hasted to deceit,
Then let Him weigh me in just balances
And Eloah will know my integrity !
If my step has turned from the path,
And my heart has gone after mine eyes,
And a stain has cleaved to my hands ;
Let me sow, and another eat,
And let my produce be rooted up !
If my heart has been enticed to a woman,
And I have laid in wait at my neighbour's door,
Then let my wife grind for another,
And let others enjoy her embraces !
For this is a wickedness,
And this a crime for the judges ;—
For this is a fire which eats down to Abaddon,
And would have rooted up all my increase.

^{*} Lit., *from upon me*.

[†] Lit., *strangeness*.

CHAPTER XXXI. 13—27.

If I have slighted my servant's cause,
Or my handmaid, when they strove with me ;
What then could I have done, had El arisen ?
What answer make Him, had He visited ?
Did not He that made me in the belly, make him ?
Did not One form us in the womb ?
If I have withheld *the* poor from *their* desire,
And caused *the* eyes of *the* widow to pine away ;
And ate my morsel alone,
So that *the* fatherless ate not thereof ;—
For since my youth, he has grown up with me as with a
father,
And her have I guided, from my mother's womb ;—
If I have seen one perishing for lack of clothing,
Or the needy without a covering ;
If his loins have not blessed me,
When he drew warmth from *the* fleece of my lambs ;
If I have shaken my hand at the fatherless,
When I saw my help in the gate ;
May my shoulder fall from the blade-bone,
And my arm be broken from its bone !
For calamity from El was my dread,
I was powerless *for evil* by reason of His majesty.
If I have made gold my hope,
And said to the fine gold—" my confidence "—
If I have exulted that my wealth was great,
And that my hand has gotten much ;
If when I beheld *the* luminary as he shined,
And *the* moon walking in splendour,
My heart was secretly beguiled,
And my hand kissed my mouth ;

* *i. e.*, when I perceived that the judges sitting in the gate were on my side.

CHAPTER XXXI. 28—39.

(This too were an offence for the judge,^{*}
For I should have denied El above;—)

If I have rejoiced in the misfortune of him that hated me,
Or exulted when evil had found him out;

(Nay, I did not permit my mouth to sin,
By demanding his life with imprecations;—)

If *the* men of my tent have not exclaimed,
“Would that we had of his viands”—we are not satisfied”—

(The stranger lodged not abroad,
I opened my doors to the wayfarer;—)

If like *other* men I have concealed my faults,
Hiding my wickedness in my breast;

Because I dreaded a great assemblage,
And the scorn of *the* tribes frightened me,
So that I kept still, *and* went not forth

Oh that there were a hearer for me!—
Behold my signature[†]—that Shaddai would answer me!^{*}
And that He with whom I contend[‡] had written his indictment!

Would I not carry it on my shoulder?
Bind it upon me like chaplets?

Of *the* number of my steps would I inform Him,
I would approach Him like a prince!

If my land has cried against me,
And its furrows all have wept;

If I have eaten its strength without payment,
And caused its owners to breathe out *their* soul,[‡]

* Heb., *a judicial offence*.

† i. e., his provisions (lit., *flesh*) are so good that we never can have enough of them. Or, as in xix. 22, *oh that we were not sated, glutted, with the woes of his flesh*.

‡ Heb., *mark*; i. e., signature appended to my written defence.

§ Heb., *man of my strife*.

• i. e., if I have extorted sighs from them.

CHAPTER XXXI. 40—XXXII. 11.

Instead of wheat, come up *the* thorn,
And instead of barley, *the* noisome weed !

The words of Job are ended.

So these three men ceased to answer Job, because he *was* righteous in his *own* eyes. Then was kindled the anger of Elihu, the son of Barakel the Buzite, of the tribe of Ram ; against Job was his anger kindled, because he justified himself rather than Elohim. And at his three friends was his anger kindled, because they had found no reply, and *yet* condemned Job. For Elihu had waited till Job had spoken, because the others were older than he ; but when Elihu saw that *there was* no reply in the mouth of the three men, then was his anger kindled.

And Elihu the son of Barakel the Buzite answered and said :

I *am* young in days, and ye *are* aged,
Therefore was I timid^a and afraid
To utter my opinion to you.

I said, " Days should speak,
And multitude of years should teach wisdom."

But it *is* a spirit in frail-man,
And breath of Shaddai which gives him understanding ;

It is not *the* many *who* are wise,
And *the* old, who understand *what is* right ;

Therefore I say, hearken to me,
I too will utter my opinion.

Lo, I awaited your sayings,
I gave ear to your reasonings,
To your search for speeches ;

^a Heb., *I crept*.

CHAPTER XXXII. 12—XXXIII. 4.

But *though* I have attended to you,
Lo, none has refuted Job,
Answered his words, among you.
Lest ye should say, "we have found out wisdom,"
El, not man, shall vanquish^b him :
For not against me did he array *his* words,
Nor will I reply to him with your discoursings.
They were broken down ; they answered no more ;
Words were taken from them ;
And I waited, because they spake not,
Because they ceased, nor answered again.
On my own part I too will reply,
I too will utter my opinion ;
For I am full of words,
The spirit in my inward parts^c constrains me ;
My inward parts are like unopened wine,
Like new wine-skins, will burst ;
I will speak and get me ease,
I will open my lips and reply ;
I will not now regard any man's person,
Nor offer flattery to any one ;
For I know not *how* to offer flattery ;
Speedily would my Maker take me off !
But hear now, O Job, my words,
And give ear to all my discourses ;
Behold now I open my mouth,
My tongue within my palate speaks ;
My words *shall express* my heart's uprightness,
And my lips shall utter knowledge purely.
The spirit of El hath created me,
And *the* breath of Shaddai quickens me ;

^b Lit., *shall put him to flight*.^c Heb., *spirit of my belly*.

CHAPTER XXXIII. 5—18.

If thou canst, return me an answer,
Set *words* in order before me—stand forth!—

Behold I, like yourself, am of El,
I too am moulded^d of clay!

Behold, fear of me need not alarm thee,
Nor my dignity weigh heavy on thee!

But in mine ears hast thou spoken,
And I heard a sound of *such words as these*;

“Pure *am* I, free from sin;
Clean, and no iniquity in me;

“Behold, He seeks a quarrel^e with me,
He reckons me as His foe;

“In the stocks He sets my feet,
He watches all my ways.”

Behold, in this, (I will answer thee) thou art not right,
For Eloah is greater than feeble man.

Wherefore didst thou strive with Him?
For of none of His dealings will He give account.^f

For El speaks once,
And twice, *if man* regard it not;

In dream—in vision of *the* night,
When deep sleep falls on men,
In slumbers on *the* couch:

Then opens He *the* ear of men,
And admonishes them secretly;^g

In order to withdraw man from *evil* deeds,
And conceal pride from man;

That He may hold back his soul from *the* pit,
And his life from perishing by the dart:

^d Heb., *nipped*.

^e Lit., *finds alienations*.

^f Lit., *answer all his matters*.

^g Lit., *seals up their admonition*, i. e., warns them secretly, as if under seal.

CHAPTER XXXIII. 19—31.

Or, he is chastened by pain upon his couch,
 And *the* struggle of his limbs *is* constant ;
 And his appetite loathes food,
 And his soul dainty viands ;
 His flesh wastes out of sight,
 So that his bones *which* were unseen, are bared,
 And his soul draws nigh to the pit,
 And his life to the angels of death.^k
 Yet if there be for him an intercedingⁱ angel,
 Chief^j among a thousand,
 To make known *that* man's righteousness,
 Then does He pity him and say,
 " Deliver him from going down into *the* pit ;
 I have obtained satisfaction."^k
 Fresher than childhood's becomes his flesh,
 He returns to *the* days of his youth ;
 He prays to Eloah, and He accepts him,
 So that he beholds His face with cries of joy,
 For he requites to frail-man his righteousness ;
 He looks *round* upon men and says,
 " I had sinned and perverted right,
 But am not requited as I deserve ;^l
 " He has rescued my soul from perishing in the grave,
 And my life beholds the light."^m
 Behold, El does all these things,
 Twice, thrice, with men ;
 To bring back his soul from *the* pit,
 That it may be lightened with *the* light of the living.
 Job, attend, hear me ;
 Be silent, and I will speak.

^k Lit., *to those who cause to die.*ⁱ Perh. more literally, *interpreting.*^j Lit., *one.*^k Lit., *ransom*, i. e., his righteousness.^l Lit., *it is not made even to me.*^m Lit., *my life beholds the light.*

CHAPTER XXXIII. 32—XXXIV. 12.

If thou hast ought to say, answer me,
Speak, for I desire thy justification.

If not, hear thou me,
Be silent, and I will teach thee wisdom.

And Elihu took up his discourse and said :

Hear my words, ye sages,
And give ear to me, ye men of knowledge ;
For *the* ear tests words,
As *the* palate tastes food !

Let us make proof for ourselves of justice,
Let us learn with one another what is good.

For Job has said, "I am righteous,
But of justice has El deprived me ;

"Though my cause be just, I pass for a liar,—
Grievous my arrow," though *I am* without transgression."

Who *is* a man like Job ?

He drinks down scoffing like water !

And he has gone to consort with workers of evil,
And to walk with men of wickedness !

For he said, "A man profits not
By his friendship^o with Elohim.

Hear me therefore, ye men of understanding ;
Far be wickedness from El,^p
And injustice from Shaddai.

For a man's work will He requite to him,
And according to *the* way of each will He cause him to find ;
Yea, of a truth, El cannot do wickedly,
Nor can Shaddai wrest justice.

^o *i. e.*, the arrow which pierces me.

^p Lit., *in his delighting himself*.

^p Lit., *profane* (*i. e.*, far) *be it to El from iniquity*.

CHAPTER XXXIV. 13—26.

Who has given Him *the* earth in charge?
Or who has confided[†] to Him all *the* universe?
Were He to be intent on Himself alone,
And gather to Himself His spirit and His breath,
All flesh would expire together,
And man return to dust.
Now, ¹hear this, if *thou hast* understanding,
Give ear to *the* voice of my words:
Could even a hater of justice, rule?
And wilt thou condemn the Just, the Mighty?
Can one say to a king, "Worthless man?"
To princes, "Wicked?"
Who accepts not person of nobles,
Nor regards rich above poor,
For they all are *the* work of His hands?
In a moment they die;
Even *at* midnight is a people troubled and passes away;
The mighty is taken off without a hand![‡]
For His eyes are on *the* ways of man,
And He beholds all his steps;
There is no darkness or death-shade,
Where doers of evil can hide themselves:
For He need not long observe man,
That he should come into judgment with El;
He breaks mighty men without number in pieces,
And sets up others in their stead;
Therefore is He acquainted with all their deeds;
And by night overthrows *them*, and they are crushed.
Because they are evil-doers, He claps His hands at them;
In a place where *men* behold;

[†] Heb., *laid (upon)*. The sense of this passage is that God would not be likely to injure or oppress the universe which originated with none but Himself.

[‡] Heb., *not by hand*, i. e., of man.

CHAPTER XXXIV. 27—37.

Because they turned away from after Him,
And had no insight into any of His ways,
So as to bring before Him *the cry of the poor* ;
For He hears *the cry of the miserable*.

When He sets at rest, who then can trouble ?
But who can behold Him if He hide *His face*,
(Whether from¹ a nation or a single man,)

Because the wicked reigns,
And because the people are ensnared."

Surely, to God it should be said,
"I have suffered—I will transgress *no more* ;
Shew Thou me that which I cannot see,
If I have done wrong I will not repeat it."

Will He requite as thou deemest right ?
"Because you reject ? because you choose, and not I ?" *saith*
God.

But speak what thou knowest.

Men of understanding will say to me,
And a wise person *who* hears me,

"Not with knowledge hath Job spoken,
And his words are not with prudence.

"Would that Job might evermore be proved
That there may be answers to wicked men !

"For he adds impiety to his sin ;
He claps *his hands* among us,
And multiplies his words against El."

¹ The meaning probably is, If He pardon and acquit and thus give peace, who can blame and condemn ?

² Lit., *over against*.

³ Or, *causing the wicked to reign on account of the snares (i. e., corruptions) of the people.*

ON EVIL, AND ON ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, AS THE HIGHEST FORM OF EVIL.

1. EVIL^a is to us the greatest of mysteries. Its origin seems to be involved in impenetrable mystery. Yea, the very fact of the existence of evil, considered apart from any question as to origin, is to us the profoundest of mysteries. In truth, evil, simply as evil, may be called the mystery of mysteries; it may be said to be that great mystery which this enormous sphinx of the Universe refuses to reveal.

2. This mystery of evil has been before all ages, and all ages have equally been compelled to confess that they were in presence of a speechless sphinx, that will not deliver up one atom of exposition as to the fundamental secret lying at the bottom of the whole collection of secrets.

3. The poets and philosophers of surpassingly metaphysical Greece may have lost the question among the intricate foldings of the roll of that awful Fate which affected even the immortal, transcendently happy gods, as well as mortal man, frail and puny withal; while, to descend the stream of time, men of the present day may lose sight of the question *either* in verbiage about the free-will of the creature having introduced evil into the *kosmos*, contrary to the plan and express intentions of the Creator; *or* in the doctrine of the high predestination of the supreme God, who ordereth and appointeth all things, and who expressly ordered the entrance of evil into the world (angelical and human) for His own wise purposes. [These forms of opinion have been specified as representing two extremes. There are a vast variety of opinions within the bounds of those two *termini*].^b

^a It is necessary to explain the stand-point of these observations. The existence of moral evil is assumed, without any attempt at explanation of what is to be understood by the same. The remarks are addressed to him only who, by circumstances, has been fitted for entering at once on the subject of *evil*, as a thing with which his thoughts are quite familiar. To him who would require to begin by a definition, as the mode of exciting the appropriate ideas, the essay cannot be considered to be at all adapted. Where "evil" simply is spoken of, both kinds, the physical and the moral, are to be understood.

^b Reference to the Persian or Zoroastrian system, and to the Hindoo or

4. A current investigation directs to the question of the proper eternity of hell-torments, and this question is frequently discussed without the slightest reference to that mystery of evil from which, however, it can by no means be legitimately separated. It is quite common (as we know) to discuss the duration of future punishment as if it could be rationally severed from all antecedently to be supposed conditions, or necessarily underlying groundwork. The least reflection will shew the vanity of the imagination. Evil, in the form of guilt and punishment, whether appertaining to this world or that which is to come, is at least unquestionably—evil. Nay, punishment in hell for ever, or, in other words, extremest misery co-existing, in the eternity to come, with the very being of God, is evil of the most amazing proportions, and of the intensest qualities. That evil which deserves such a hell, if it began ever to be, must have had some cause or other; and that all evil began sometime to be, Christians are, I suppose, in the most perfect accord.^c This present evil, and a future hell, are then intimately connected, by logical sequence of thought, with the great mystery of evil in the universe. Whatever superficially-minded men may fancy, the two things are joined in such a way that they cannot by any possibility be divorced from each other.

5. All the profound philosophers of antiquity perceived that everything beginning to be may have an end. So much so, the thought was made the substance of a maxim, and it was laid down, without denial from any quarter, that everything having a beginning in time may have an end in time. Of course, the

Brahminical system, is purposely avoided. I have sedulously kept myself apart from Oriental, and confined myself to Occidental aspects. Greece, whatever she may have derived from Eastern sources, was thoroughly occidental in her fundamental cast of thought. Greece, though the first, afforded the highest exhibition of the powers, in logical and metaphysical directions, of western mind. Of course this will be falsified so soon as ever these modern ages shall supply philosophers surpassing the models of those classical times; but it is quite vain to look for metaphysicians and logicians superior in the fields of abstract thought (or Pure Reason) to those *non plus ultra* philosophers, Plato, the magnificent poet-philosopher, and Aristotle, the genius of universal philosophy.

^c The contrary doctrine, which posites the existence of an Ahriman, or original Evil Principle, subsisting in a Person, is not at all to be by us discussed at the present time.

maxim was capable of application to evil, when considered as having had a time-commencement.

6. No doubt the maxim merely determines the *possible* end of that which had a beginning. It does not determine that the world, or the evil that is in the world, may not be perpetuated for ever in consequence of *will*—the will of God that such perpetuation should be.

7. Accordingly the ground commonly chosen by Christians, who maintain that absolute perpetuity of evil is, *God will have it so*.

8. One of the forms (and perhaps the main form) adopted by advocates for that foundation-doctrine is the form which manifests itself in application to isolated passages of Holy Writ, as the vouchers for the truth of the greatly-prized tenet. The gentlemen alluded to present you with so many texts of Scripture, alleging that these affirm it to be God's will that the wicked should be turned into hell, and there punished through or to all eternity.

9. If you, in turn, present the persons now referred to with any purely philosophical considerations tending to impugn their darling tenet, they refuse to listen, saying, Thus it is written, and that is enough. Yea, should you present them with any general consideration, derived even from the Scriptures themselves, designed to throw doubt on the reality of the truth of their doctrine, they equally refuse to pay attention to a general reflection of this nature. It is so written, they say, in those texts, and that is enough for us; we will not go beyond this in the matter.

10. Let us weigh, therefore, the reasonableness and the consequences of such procedure. We ask those persons (who profess to be greatly concerned for the interests of vital Christianity) to take heed as to what they are doing. If there be in truth such a doctrine in Scripture as that which they say is contained in their texts, the doctrine must harmonize with the other great doctrines taught in the Scriptures. For if there be doctrines of important kinds in Scripture which contradict each other, or, at least, which cannot hang together, then the Scriptures themselves are self-contradictory, or at least inconsistent,

place with place, and cannot have proceeded from the one God of truth. To allow important contradictions to be in the Bible is the same as to deny it. It is giving it up to the infidel as his prey, to do what he likes with it.

11. No enlightened Christian could for a moment admit that the doctrines of Revelation contradict each other. Taking this, therefore, for granted, let us advance to a consideration drawn from other places in the Bible. Yet the appeal shall be, not so much to detached texts, however numerous, as to declarations which run through The Book, from the beginning to the end. Let me, however, first present the tenet itself in its simplest form, or divested of extrinsic matter. I accept, says our orthodox brother, the fact, which the Bible unquestionably declares, that sinners dying impenitent shall go into everlasting torments, simply because the Holy Spirit so declares in those and those texts.

12. Now, in resting content with this, that the doctrine is thought to be seen in so many isolated texts, what are you doing? Is it not your duty, as a Christian, to take care that there be in the case attention paid to the whole analogy of the faith? You yourself will, so far as words can go, admit that God is good, besides being a God of irreproachable justice and spotless holiness. Is it not your part to see that the doctrine of the universal goodness of God, and of His love to men, can really comport with the other doctrine, that that same God has prepared an everlasting hell for myriads of His intelligent creatures, whom He will please to torment ceaselessly? If you shrink (as I almost fancy I see you do) from words importing that God can delight to torture men in hell; do not you see that here is indeed a shrinking of your spirit from the doctrine itself, when represented in its genuine colours? You make an eternity of torments depend on *will*: you give the will of God as the cause operating to produce the effect; and you cannot be allowed to resile from what is plainly involved in your own tenet. The question thus is, How can there be, in the nature of things, a reconciliation between the love of God and His desire (=will) for the perpetuation of punishment in hell, the greatest of tortures, and of evils?

13. It is surely a perilous thing for a Christian theologian to attach himself to certain detached places in Scripture, as constituting his only ground for accepting such a portentous dogma as is that of the never-ending torments of the damned. The passages with which our orthodox brother is content are unquestionably limited in number: they are likewise peculiar in character. Contemplate, then, at close quarters this ominous dogma, as said to be contained in the verses founded on, and it will be certainly found that our natural instincts, especially our finer sensibilities, will all shrink back affrighted and dismayed, and utterly disconcerted at the dreadful apparition. "The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever" (Rev. xiv. 11). Take these words, as commonly explained and understood, and we have a fire in which countless myriads of us creatures of yesterday shall lie—or, rather, shall *not* lie, since lying denotes a posture of at least comparative composure—weltering in flames of never-ending burning, serving to torture the victims through all the course of God's own eternity: this is a picture, the steady contemplation of which is enough to overturn the strongest brain. Meditate upon the same continuously, and *madness lies that way.*^d The man does not live who could

^d The late Professor Butler, of Dublin, a man able as a philosopher, and no less able as a divine, was an advocate of the doctrine of eternal punishment, and one of his sermons is occupied with a defence of the doctrine. Yet this gifted propounder of the dogma in question could write thus:—"I have hinted already, and I repeat it, that were it possible for man's imagination to conceive the horrors of such a doom as this, all reasoning about it were at an end; it would scorch and wither all the powers of human thought. Human life were at a stand, could the things be really felt as they deserve. Even for him who can humbly trust himself, comparatively secure in faith and obedience, were the thin veil of this poor shadowy life suddenly undrawn, and those immortal agonies, that never-dying death, made known in the way of direct perception,—and those, it may be, that such a one, with the keen sympathies so characteristic of the Christian, loves and values, seen to be at last among the victims of that irreparable doom,—*can we doubt that he would come forth with intellect blanched and idealess from a sight too terrible for any whose faculties are not on the scale of eternity itself?*"—In the place referred to at the beginning of the extract, the language is equally strong: stronger it could not well be, unless a second Dante were in the field. The Dublin Professor had spoken of the "truth," as *involving the whole face of nature in gloom, hanging the very heavens in black*, etc., etc. The sermon in question has for its title, *Eternal Punishment*; it forms

quietly concentrate his attention upon the features of such a scene, and go away, and be the same man as he was before. Now, if this be so,—and I appeal to the 10,000 pulpits of Great Britain from which the dreadful doctrine, in all its horrors, is never now descanted on^e—does it not become the very warmest advocate of everlasting punishment to weigh well the real circumstances of his case. Does the devoted advocate pretend that he could deduce his doctrine, or anything like it, from the revelation of the meaning of the name (and nature) of Jehovah communicated, as a special high mercy, to Moses: “The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious,” etc. (Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7.) Of course our advocate does not pretend anything of the kind. Or would he pretend to discover connecting links between his doctrine and the *Our Father* of Jesus Christ, or the *God is love* of the Apostle John? No; the orthodox believer does not pretend that he can discover any such connecting links. He does not maintain that his favourite tenet harmonizes, in an easy natural manner, with the general scope of the Scriptures describing the inner nature, or the essential moral attributes of Our Father who is in the heavens. The one thing is not alleged to look with a kindly eye in the direction of the other thing. Nothing of the sort. All our orthodox friend does is, to take a certain number of texts of Scripture into a corner, where, sitting down, he complacently distils the essence of the selected extracts, and presenting it admiringly to all passers by, declares, Lo! I shew you a thing that is exceedingly palatable: it is in these isolated places. The quintessence of his texts may be reduced to a simple formula (ready for constant use)—Damnation in hell is by the will of God, and God continues, without any end, the existence in hell, because He so wills it. Does not

the twenty-sixth sermon in the volume of his posthumous *Sermons Doctrinal and Practical*. The edition before me is the fourth, and the volume is dated 1864.

* Professor Butler (mentioned in the preceding note) adverts to the circumstance (regretfully, of course!) that pulpits “in our days” do not ring with such “great Scripture truths” as “the awful everlasting doom of the wicked.” He mourns over the “lack of the directness and simplicity of Scripture enforcement,” with regard to such truths (pp. 369, 370). Heaven help us! Qualified to relish such horrors, we should be ready (*teste* William Archer Butler, Professor of Moral Philosophy) to go stark raving mad.

the mere statement of this read vastly like a caricature? Yet, alas ! there is no caricature in the case.

14. It cannot be doubted that the hour has come for a full discussion of this whole subject. At the time of the Reformation, or upwards of three centuries ago, the topic was not before men's minds in the sense that it was consciously canvassed, and made to undergo the most scrutinizing examination. On the contrary, we may allow that the Christian world, as a whole, simply and quietly acquiesced in the doctrine of never-ending punishment. The causes which led to, or were concerned in such a result, need not here be investigated. The set time for enquiry and scrutiny was not come. All that can be truthfully said is, that here and there an ecclesiastical writer, or a Christian philosopher, doubted the truth of the prevailing doctrine. There were then, no doubt, *Origens*, or merciful doctors, as there have been in all ages, and in all countries. But things are quite changed. There is a ferment in men's minds on the topic, and the agitation is every day increasing; and it is palpable to those who know anything of the signs of the times, that the subject (as well as some other subjects in theology) will not be set at rest until after the very fullest discussion; until, indeed, God's real truth on the subject shall be made fully to appear. It is vain for any man to prate that it can be otherwise. What the ultimate decision of the Catholic Church, or (to word it otherwise) Christian Philosophy shall be, is not for one at the present moment to decide.

15. The day has been when a topic in theology might be looked at without reference to its connection with other topics; but that time has gone by. If this doctrine of eternal torments do really involve the ascription of monstrous attributes to God, or if it imply, in truth, consequences which Christianity can by no means tolerate; then, the knell of the doctrine has been sounded, and it is time for the advocates thereof to be up and looking about them. What would they themselves say to a theologian who maintained any doctrine not held by them—say, that of the corporeality of God—by arguing, Here I have so many passages speaking of God's hands, feet, and other bodily organs; and I will not consider the passages which declare the

true infiniteness of God, nor shall I sit down to ask how the two sets of passages are to be reconciled, and which of them is to give way as figurative, leaving the other to remain as the simply absolute truth. I ask, what would you do were you to meet with such an opponent?—and such an opponent might be secured without seeking for him so far away as *Great Salt Lake*. You would certainly say that he was altogether unreasonable. And as it is there, so must it be here. You must, in short, consider your favourite tenet in connection with the other doctrines of Christianity. Specifically, you must lay it alongside the doctrine of the Atonement—Atonement grounded in the justice or righteousness of God, as well as in His mercy or love; the doctrine, in other words, of the two Adams, the one standing for (and being) all humanity as lost, the other standing for (and being) all humanity as redeemed. Nay, you must, brother, go higher and wider; you must consider your doctrine in connection with God's great attributes, His infiniteness, His perfection in intellectual and all moral qualities. If your tenet will not abide the most searching examination in the directions indicated, the tenet must go down, and no noisy repetition of a few texts will avail, or go any way to save it alive. In fact, unless you court scrutiny, you are in reality a coward, flying, or minded to fly, from the field of contest.

PELASG.

The Rev. F. C. Cook, who undertook the duties of general editor of what is called *The Speaker's Commentary on the Bible*, states that the delay in the publication has been caused by the illness of some contributors, and by the advancement of others to positions involving duties which made it impossible for them to complete their several portions within the time originally contemplated. This remark applies especially to the Pentateuch. The object is to present the most important results bearing upon the interpretation of Holy Scripture, which have been up to the present time elicited by discussions and inquiry, whether in England or on the Continent. "The work is, however, sufficiently advanced," writes Mr. Cook, "for me to be able to state that it will also comprise no small amount of independent research."—*The Saturday Review*.

FORENSIC IMPUTATION.

WITHIN a comparatively recent period, and certainly not until long after the Reformation, an opinion has prevailed in a section of the Anglican Church to the effect, that by virtue of, or as incidental to, the redemption of mankind by our Lord, his righteousness is to be regarded as having been transferred to believers, and is imputed to them and regarded as theirs, while on the other hand, their guilt is to be considered as transferred to Him, or imputed to Him, and regarded as His. And this opinion has been exalted into a dogmatic form under the somewhat fantastic name, 'Forensic Imputation,' or 'Reciprocal or Alternating Imputation.'

This belief is commonly held by those who accept also the far more ancient dogma first taught by St. Augustine, that Adam's offence is imputed to, and punished in, all his descendants. Various as these several propositions are in substance, a certain degree of symmetry—a fanciful interchange—is doubtless obtained by placing them in juxtaposition. The imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants is balanced by the *reimputation* of that offence to Christ, in exchange for which comes in the imputation of his righteousness to believers. Since, however, neither of these three propositions involves of necessity the reception of the others, each must be considered upon its own merits, and for the present I shall confine myself to the examination of the opinion, that the sins of believers are to be considered as either transferred or imputed to our Lord. The words "imputation" and "transfer" are commonly used indifferently as though they were synonyms, although *transfer* is certainly something much more than mere *imputation*.

Following out the doctrine of imputed guilt to its legitimate result,—to what may well be called "*the bitter end*,"—some, if not all, who hold it have not scrupled to affirm that Christ's passion is to be regarded (not as He taught) as a voluntary laying down of his life for the sheep of his fold,—not as our Church teaches, that "the *offering* of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world;" but that we are to look upon his death as the

deserved penalty or punishment for the imputed or transferred guilt,—that, as a malefactor, he died a malefactor's death. Thus the present Bishop of Peterborough, in his Sermon on the *Unknown Sufferings of Christ*, preached at Leicester in October, 1864, and since published, says, "The hand of God did not support him as it supported martyrs, but rather *crushed him beneath its weight.*"—"Let me believe that as I was in effect crucified on Calvary—he will in effect stand before the throne in my person; mine the sin, *his the penalty; his the shame*, mine the glory; *his the thorn*, mine the crown." "After man had done his worst, *worse remained for Christ to bear; He has now fallen into his Father's hands*, in his bitter cup it is not the gall infused by the malignity of the wicked which is the bitterest ingredient."—"We know and are sure, that *God forsook his beloved Son on Calvary* in order that He might not forsake us." And again, "Perhaps the remorse of a reprobate abandoned by God—the remorse which caused Judas to seek refuge in suicide—the remorse of a hopeless death-bed—approaches more nearly than anything on earth to those sufferings of Christ. But in perdition only, in that living death, the death of the soul, the death which a horrible consciousness survives, the death from which there is no resurrection, will it be possible for the sinner to know what is meant by the cry, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.'?" In the same spirit, a modern writer, held in some esteem in that section of the Church to which he is attached, says, in allusion to the death of Christ, "*Yet unless in his case it was punitive*, the salvation of sinners must cease for ever; it is not true that by his stripes we can be healed." "After our Lord Christ condescended to take on him our sins, it would not have been just for him not to account for them. His responsibility for them was then the same *as if he had himself sinned.* On this proceeded God's treatment of him, *in hiding his face from him* till the debt was paid."^a

Such, then, are the opinions which in our time are held on the subject of imputed guilt and retributive justice. If upon examination we should be satisfied that the doctrine is a fanciful extravagance, destitute alike of Scriptural warrant and of the

^a Haldane, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans.*

authority of the Church, we cannot fail to regard the expressions here quoted as highly injurious and irreverent, notwithstanding the Bishop's denunciations of those who refuse their assent to his teaching. Not indeed "*more majorum*,"—by bell, book, and candle,—but according to the modern, but not less energetic, method of representing those who differ from *him* as enemies of true religion. Thus in the sermon before referred to, he says, that the *retributive* character of Christ's sufferings has been with more or less boldness denied by enemies of the cross who from without, and by enemies of the cross who from within, in evil days assail the faith.

It cannot be denied that three or four passages may be found in Scripture which, at first sight, would seem to favour the doctrine of imputed guilt, but upon examination it will be seen that these may just as well, or indeed far better, be understood in another sense; that they have never been received by the Church in the sense which is occasionally attributed to them; and, further, that various other passages are met with of a much more explicit and authoritative nature from which a different, or indeed a contrary, conclusion must be drawn; and when, as sometimes happens, an apparent contradiction is found between passages confessedly obscure and others of which the meaning is clear, the former must give way.

One of the passages frequently quoted in support of the proposition in question is found in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah: "And the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Several writers have doubted, whether this prophecy ought to be regarded as relating to Christ; but as it has certainly been the prevailing usage of the Church to apply it to him, even if it were not originally spoken of him, it seems hardly worth while now to consider that question, which indeed is not material to the argument.

It seems very doubtful, as will be presently seen, if this passage has been accurately rendered in our Authorized Version; but assuming that it is so, it would be obviously most unsafe to rely upon it, or upon any other prophetic expression standing alone, for an exposition of Christian doctrine. For that, we can look only to Christ and his apostles. The language of

prophecy is almost always obscure and usually very figurative, and if understood literally, can hardly fail to lead to error in dealing with any subject, but especially when treating of a mystery so far surpassing all human comprehension, as the redemption of mankind. Of the highly figurative character of the passage in question there can be no doubt. The imagery throughout is as poetical as it is beautiful:—A root out of a dry ground,—a tender plant,—sheep straying from their pasture,—a gentle lamb led quietly and unsuspectingly to its death,—a sheep standing in mute submission before the shearers;—such is the ‘chamber of imagery’ in which the prophet has placed Him upon whom is laid the burthen of the iniquities of the many. But since iniquity is that which cannot possibly be laid upon, or transferred to, another, the expression, like those with which it is associated, must of necessity be taken figuratively, and if a figure, what figure? Can we doubt that the phrase, “our iniquities,” is put metonymically for “the punishment of our iniquities.” Thus understood, and only thus, the expression is brought into admirable harmony with the whole context. It is equivalent to the statements that “he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows;” that “he was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities;” that “the chastisement of our peace was upon him;” “with his stripes we are healed;” “for the transgression of my people was he stricken.” And not only so, but what is of far more importance, the passage is thus brought into correspondence with our Lord’s own memorable declarations: “I am the good shepherd;” “I lay down my life for the sheep;” “No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself.”

For these reasons, even if we take the passage to be accurately rendered, it might very well be understood as indicating a condition of vicarious suffering, to the exclusion of any notion of transferred or imputed guilt; but there seems good reason to believe that this text, like some others upon which important propositions have been founded or defended, if not actually mistranslated, is at least capable of a meaning the converse of that conveyed by the Authorized Version. If we turn to the Septuagint, the sentence stands thus: “The Lord hath de-

livered him (or given him up) to, or for, our iniquities." According to Gesenius, the passage should be rendered, "But Jehovah threw all our punishment on him;" and, according to Rosenmüller, "But Jehovah commanded to fall on him alone the punishment which we should have endured." Now, if we adopt these renderings, the proposition is reduced to this: that by, or through, the person spoken of,—on his account, or for his sake,—our sins were to be pardoned; he enduring the punishment due in respect of them. Not the slightest intimation that the pardon was to be obtained by the transfer or imputation of the sins of the pardoned to Him through whose merits and vicarious suffering the pardon was procured. Such a proposition, if to be found at all in Scripture, is not here.

Thus much for the only passage that can be cited from the Old Testament as bearing upon the question. In the New Testament we meet with but three,—two from St. Paul, and one from St. Peter, that can be regarded as favouring the belief in imputed guilt. St. Peter speaks of Him "who, His own self, bare our sins in His own body on the tree." St. Paul says, "He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin," and "He hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." The sentiment being nearly the same in both these passages, and the mode of expressing it being almost the same, both may well be considered together.

Before, however, attempting to explain the meaning of any obscure or difficult passage, it is indispensable to take into account the author's method, or *usus loquendi*. It was said of St. Paul, in his own time, that his writings were hard to be understood, and they are undoubtedly distinguishable from those of his contemporaries, as well as all other writers before or since, by several striking peculiarities.^a He was accustomed to the frequent use of metonyms and metonymical phrases, and of antitheses or contrasts. He hardly ever advanced a proposi-

^a Dean Alford, in the preface to the second volume of his edition of the Greek Testament, enumerates, amongst other characteristics of the Apostle's style, "Frequent and complicated antitheses, requiring great caution in *exegesis*. For, frequently, the different members of the antithesis are not to be taken in the same extent of meaning. Sometimes the literal and metaphorical meanings are interchanged in a curious and intricate manner, so that in the first member

tion which he did not illustrate by one or both these methods, and he frequently makes his contrasts double, sometimes treble. Thus in Romans v., no less than nineteen consecutive sentences are found (with only one parenthesis), all intended to enforce the same sentiment, namely,—the *oneness* of Christ, and *his* influence upon the condition of *his* followers, by means of an illustration drawn from the *oneness* of Adam, and the influence of *his* character and conduct upon the fortunes of *his* descendants. Each of these clauses is found to comprise either a type and its antitype, a thesis and antithesis, or a proposition with its contrast or comparison; and with only one exception these comparisons or contrasts are double, thus forming a chain of which each link is fourfold. The passages now in question furnish two more instructive examples of the same peculiarity. The apostle wanted a contrast for “Him who knew not sin,” and he formed it by describing Him (metonymically) as being *made sin*. He sought for an antithesis for our being made the righteousness of God *in Him*, and he found it in the expression, he made Him to be sin *for us*. He wanted an antithesis for our redemption from the *curse of the law*, and he obtained it by describing Him as being made a *curse for us*.

It must be obvious that if any author, whether sacred or profane, will have a contrast or comparison, and that often double or complex for almost every proposition, it can only be at the risk of occasional obscurity: and if in reading his works we are led to confound metaphor with analogy, and accept the figurative as literal, there is no error, however gross, into which we may not fall, and hardly any heresy which may not be defended.

In considering what was intended by these expressions, it is essential, first, to notice what those topics were upon which the apostle was engaged. In neither passage was he speaking of the character and nature of the Redeemer; he was treating only of

of the two antithetical clauses the subject may be literal, and the predicate metaphorical, and in the second, *vice versâ*, the subject metaphorical, and the predicate literal. Sometimes, again, the terms of one member are to be amplified to their fullest extent, *almost to an exaggerated meaning*, whereas those of the second are to be reduced down almost to a depreciated meaning.”

the redemption. In 2 Cor. v. 19 he is speaking of Christ as "reconciling the world unto himself," "of the word of reconciliation," the "being reconciled to God." In Gal. iii. the topic is justification by faith. In either case the argument would have been complete and convincing without the words in question, and probably any other apostle would have omitted them. In saying this I desire not to be understood as impugning the apostle's teaching, or disparaging his method; I wish merely to call attention to the peculiarities of that method, without attending to which his meaning is often misunderstood.

But to resume. The apostle speaks of Christ not as a sinner, or a sinful person, but as *sin*;—not as an accursed person, but as a *curse*. Is it credible, that if he had intended to describe him as guilty, whether by imputation or transfer or otherwise, of the sins of believers, he would not have used terms appropriate to convey his meaning? It would be absurd, and is impossible, to accept these expressions in their *literal* meaning, inasmuch as sin is a quality or condition, and a curse is a state of misery or sentence of punishment; but a man or person can no more become or be termed a *sin* or a *curse*, than he can be regarded as an opinion or a virtue; it would be as reasonable to affirm that a sin or curse could become incarnate.

Since, then, these statements must of necessity be taken to be figurative, it remains to consider what meaning is to be attached to them, and to St. Peter's statement that He bare our sins in His own body on the tree. All these expressions are undoubtedly metonymical, and must be taken to indicate one of two things or conditions. Either the words "curse" and "sin" are put—as is sometimes affirmed—for a condition of cursedness and sinfulness, or they are intended to represent the punishment borne by accursed or guilty persons. Consistently with the context, one or other of these constructions must prevail; there is no alternative; nor, indeed, has any alternative ever been suggested.

Let us then consider the first of these propositions. Are we to understand the words "sin" and "a curse," when applied to our Lord, as equivalent to the assertion that the guilty condition of believers was transferred to Him, as incidental to the work

of redemption. When we take upon ourselves to judge of God's dealings with his creatures, by means of analogies drawn from their dealings with each other, we may perchance acquire some faint apprehension of the reality; but when we presume to invent and imagine transactions which never did, and never can, occur amongst men, and proceed to argue from analogies thus fanciful and false, we are acting like children in their sports "*making believe.*"

God is sometimes represented in Scripture as "jealous," or "angry," or "repentant;" we know, however, that these are terms of necessity rather than of strict propriety. Not used, because they represent in the faintest degree the character and attributes of the Deity, since it is as impossible that He should be swayed by human passions and emotions, or influenced by human motives, as that He should be afflicted with human infirmities. But these expressions nevertheless do indicate (as nearly as our faculties will allow us to apprehend), by means of figures or images derived from human experience, somewhat of the character of His dealings with men. But when we come to speak of the transfer of guilt to the Redeemer, we not only adopt language unknown to Scripture, but we use terms which have no meaning whatever as applied to human transactions. Our analogy is drawn from a mere fiction,—from conditions which never did nor can exist. What is guilt but a state or condition,—resulting from evil thoughts, or words, or deeds?

" 'Tis the fiend,
Th' avenging fiend, that follows us behind
With whips and stings."

It is the dark shadow of what has gone before, and as the shadow has no existence apart from the substance, so, unless the actions and thoughts of our past lives could be transferred to another, our errors and our guilt, whether pardoned or unpardoned, must inevitably remain our own; they are ourselves; they make up our individual life and being; and as they are, so must they ever be, utterly incapable of transfer.

But it is said, that although there might not be any actual transfer of guilt, still it might be *imputed*; that is, that although Christ was in no respect guilty in respect of human sins, he was

regarded, and indeed treated, by his Father (and we are so to regard him) as if he had been. This is indeed the doctrine of "Forensic Imputation;" in other words, the adoption or borrowing of a legal fiction to describe the relations between the Father and the Son. The distinction, however, thus drawn, is one with very slight difference, and leaves the proposition just as objectionable and unscriptural as before. As Moses Stewart, in his admirable *Commentary on the Romans*, has observed:—"In all the Bible there exists not such a declaration as that one man's sin or righteousness is imputed to another."

If we proceed to examine the context in which the words in question occur, we shall find ample grounds for rejecting the meaning which has been ascribed to them. For instance, when the apostle says that he knew no sin (or rather that he knew *not* sin), can we suppose that he intended to represent him as sinful, either by imputation or transfer, of the sins of the whole world; at one and the same time as sinless and sinful? The motive assigned for his great work is, that we might be made the righteousness of God (or righteous before God). How righteous? Not simply and abstractedly, but "*in Him.*" That is, in and by his spotless holiness and perfect obedience. Is this consistent with the theory of imputation?

With regard to the expression, "Being made a curse for us," St. Paul himself has so expanded and illustrated his meaning, that it is clear he did not design to represent our Lord as in any sense the subject of imputed or transferred guiltiness. "For" (or "as," or "just as") "it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Certainly these words do not mean that every one that is hanged upon a tree is, by reason of that mode of death, to be regarded as a guilty or accursed person. It is only meant that hanging on a tree was the death to which guilty persons were liable. To hold otherwise would be to affirm that the *mode* of death was the measure of guilt,—in fact, constituted the guilt,—and that thus all martyrs and innocent persons who have suffered such a death thereby became guilty. The illustration qualifies and explains the preceding statement, and may satisfy us that all that the apostle intended to teach was this,—that in order to redeem believers from the curse of the law,

Christ suffered an ignominious death,—one usually inflicted on criminals.

We proceed to inquire how far the belief that St. Paul held this doctrine of Forensic Imputation is consistent with the general scope and tenor of his teachings, and with other passages of Scripture. In Rom. iii. 25, he states distinctly—and in the succeeding verse, for the sake of emphasis, he repeats the statement—that God had set forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood; not, indeed, by any imputation or transfer of human guilt, but “to declare *his righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past.” So in Rom. v. 18, it is by the *righteousness* of one that the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. In the same way, we find it declared by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with reference to the ceaseless intercession of Christ, that “such an high priest became us holy, harmless, undefiled, *separate from sinners*, and made higher than the heavens.” And, again, that “Christ, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself *without spot* to God.” Is it credible that such expressions could have been used by one who considered that the Saviour of the world was, in any sense, guilty, or to be regarded as guilty, in respect of the sins of believers? So, also, St. Peter tells his disciples that they were “redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb *without blemish and without spot*.” How little in accordance with such teaching is the belief that Christ is to be regarded as blemished and defaced by human guilt? Numerous other passages might be cited to shew that the doctrine of imputed or transferred guilt was not only not taught by the apostles, but was inconsistent with, if not opposed to, their teaching: but we pass on to consider what our Lord himself said on the subject, or, rather, what he left unsaid.

It is recorded in all the synoptic Gospels that, on the occasion of the last supper, He declared that his blood was “shed for many for the remission of sins.” He declared that He came “to give his life a ransom for many.” And when He compared himself to the Good Shepherd he said, “I lay down my life for the sheep. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up

again." And these passages comprise, in substance, all that He is recorded to have said on this momentous subject. Surely the Bishop of Peterborough must have overlooked these memorable words when he stated that,—“after man had done his worst, worse remained for Christ to bear, because he *had fallen into his Father's hands*,” and that “*God forsook his beloved Son on Calvary*,” etc. However, if—as is beyond all question—we are unable to discover in our Lord's own discourses the slightest trace of imputed or transferred guilt, or that his death was “*punitive*,” we shall not greatly err if we reject these opinions as fond and fanciful extravagancies.

It has been considered by many eminent men, in all ages of the Church, that the death of Christ is to be regarded as an *expiatory sacrifice*; an opinion founded principally upon the literal interpretation of some passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which may perhaps as well, or indeed far better, be received as tropical, by way of illustration—and a feeble illustration—as all illustrations must be—of the nature of such a work. But, without considering the merits of this belief, it will readily be seen that it is altogether in conflict with the notion of transferred or imputed guilt. If we indeed regard Christ as a sacrifice, we must also look upon him as freed from all taint or suspicion of sin; as “the Lamb without blemish and without spot.” For, as in the heathen sacrifices the victim was invariably—

“Some spotless lamb, or heifer white as milk,
Or bull with golden horns, arrayed in silk,”

so those creatures which the Jews were enjoined to offer in sacrifice were to be as pure and spotless as possible. They were to be lambs or kids, turtle doves or young pigeons, young rams and heifers and bullocks without blemish. The *scape goat*, over which the priest was to confess the iniquities and transgressions of the people of Israel, and upon whose head their sins were to be laid, was *not* that which was to be offered in sacrifice, but was to be driven forth into the desert, as abhorred of God and forsaken and hated of men.

It has sometimes been asserted, by those who hold the belief in question, that it was held by the Fathers, or, at least, by

several of the most eminent of them.^b A slight examination, however, of what they said, that can in any way be construed as bearing upon the subject, will at once disprove this assertion. In their time the doctrine, as now understood, had not assumed any definite shape, and all that we can know of their opinions is to be collected from their comments upon those passages already referred to, as supposed to bear upon it. In the writings of those of the Fathers who preceded St. Jerome, no expressions can be found which, when reasonably understood, favour the doctrine of imputed righteousness; and certainly not the slightest trace is met with of the belief that the guilt of believers was to be regarded as imputed or transferred to Christ. No such expressions as "imputation" or "transfer," whether forensic or otherwise, are to be found in their writings.

In his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Corinthians*, St. Jerome had occasion to refer to the passage before referred to, on which he observes as follows:—"Christ, who was without sin, is said to have been made sin for us, *because for our sins he died*. Christ, who knew not sin, the Father made sin for us, that, as a victim offered for sin was in the law called '*sin*,' according as it is written in Leviticus,—'*And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his sin*;' so likewise, '*Christ being offered for our sins, received the name of sin*.'" Here, then, we have a distinct statement that St. Paul's expression is to be understood only in a metonymical sense, and that Christ was to be regarded not as sin, or a sinful person, but as a victim or expiation for sins and sinful persons; and St. Augustine, in treating of the same passage, explained it in precisely the same sense. Thus he says,—"That which is somewhat obscurely said by the apostle is explained in two ways, either because the resemblances of things are called by the names of those very things which they resemble, and so the apostle may be understood to designate the likeness of sinful flesh as sin, or because the sacrifices for sin were under the law called sin, which sacrifices were all figures of the body of Christ, who is the

^b Thus Dr. Faber, in his treatise on *The Primitive Doctrine of Justification*, ch. 4, says, "The doctrine of Imputation, in its highest form, the form I mean of reciprocal or alternating imputation, is distinctly maintained by the writer to Diognetus, by Chrysostom, by Athanasius, by Augustine, and by Bernard."

1 true and only sacrifice for sin. These words, when it is said that God hath made Christ to be sin who knew not sin, cannot, as it seems to me, be better (*convenientius*) understood than that Christ *was made a sacrifice for sin, and on that account was called sin.*"^c

Another passage to the same effect is found in *De Verbis Domini*, chap. xlviii.: "The apostle says, He hath made him to be sin for us who knew not sin. He who knew not sin. Who is he that knew not sin, but the same that said, Behold the prince of this world cometh, and shall find nothing in me? He made him to be sin for us who knew not sin. God made Christ himself, who was ignorant (*nescientem*) of sin, sin for us. What is this, my brethren? If it should be said, *He sinned against him, or that he made him to bear sin, it would seem intolerable.* How can we understand what is said, He made him to be sin, as if Christ himself became sin? Those who have known the Old Testament Scriptures acknowledge what I say. For, indeed, it is not said once, but very often, very decidedly. The sacrifices for sins are called sins (*'peccata dicta sunt sacrificia pro peccatis'*). For instance, a ram or goat was offered for sin. Whatever the victim was which was offered for sin, was called sin. The sacrifice for sin was therefore called sin. So, as the law says, the priests were to lay their hands upon the sin. Therefore he made Him who knew not sin, sin for us, that is, a sacrifice for sin. Christ became sin, was offered up, and sin was destroyed. The blood of the Redeemer was shed, and the bond (*cautio*) of the debtor is blotted out. This is the blood which was shed for many for the remission of sins."

In the *Enchiridion ad Laurentium*, lib. i., cap. xli., we find the following passage to the same effect: "For the apostle, when he had said, 'We beseech you for Christ's sake be ye reconciled to God,' immediately added, 'For he hath made Him to be sin for us who knew not sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.' He does not say, as is seen in *some lying MSS.*, He who knew not sin *committed sin for us*, but he says that God, to whom we must be reconciled, made Him, that is, Christ, to be sin for us, that is,—a sacrifice for sins by

^c *Contra duas Epist. Pelag. ad Bonifacium*, lib. iii., chap. 6.

which we might be reconciled." This exposition he repeats with equal force and clearness in several other of his works, particularly in his treatise *De Verbis Domini in Evan. secundum Joan*, sermon xlviii.

Nor is this great man's opinion less decided as to the meaning to be ascribed to the passage in the Epistle to the Galatians. He altogether denied that this should be understood in the sense that the Redeemer was to be regarded as sinful or accursed, by imputation, or transfer, or otherwise. Thus in the treatise, *Contra Faustum Manichæum*, lib. iv., cap. iii., he says, "So also of sin; not only is it that evil thing which is worthy of punishment, but even death itself, which came from sin, may be called sin. For God said in Paradise, In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. This is the curse which hung upon the tree. He may deny that Christ became a curse who denies that he died, but he who shall confess that he died, cannot deny that that death came from sin, *and that on this account* he is called sin. Let us hear what the apostle says, 'He was made a curse for us,' as if it were said, 'He died for us as one accursed,' because death itself comes from the curse, and every sin is a curse, whether that which happens so that punishment should follow, or the punishment which, in a certain sense, is called sin, because it proceeds from sin. For Christ indeed, *without guilt, underwent our punishment*, that so he might absolve (*solvere*) our guilt, and end our punishment."

But, although it is impossible to find in St. Augustine's writings any trace of the doctrine of 'Forensic Imputation,' or any reason to believe that he had even heard of it; it has been argued most unfairly, from an expression found in his commentary on Psalm xxii., that he held it. In his exposition of this Psalm, he assumes that it had reference to Christ, and the usage of the Church in this, as in many other more important matters, has been to follow his teaching. It may, however, well be doubted, if in this particular that teaching is not erroneous. The only plausible reason for regarding this Psalm as prophetic, and the only reason assigned by St. Augustine seems to consist in this, that our Lord, when on the cross, made use of the expression with which it opens, and that

those who stood by quoted or adopted another passage from the same Psalm. This, however, is perfectly consistent with the belief that the Psalm was simply an expression of the writer's own feelings, and was in no way spoken in the sense of prophecy, especially when it is seen that several other passages occur in the immediate context which cannot possibly apply or be attributed to Christ. We know how conversant he was with Jewish literature, and how often he quoted it.

It happens, however, to be altogether immaterial for the present purpose to consider whether the Psalm did, or did not, refer to our Lord. St. Augustine seems to have used a very inaccurate translation, and instead of reading in the first verse as it is rendered in our Authorized Version, and as found in all accurate *codices*, "the words of my *roaring*," he read "the words of *my sins*." It is needless to inquire how he came to fall into this mistake, the more strange, that while the original, when strictly rendered, is almost unintelligible with reference to the context, the expression which he adopts, "words of my sins," is quite so; but reading the passage thus amiss, he proceeds to explain it. He says, "*Of what sins?* of whom is it said that he did no sin, neither was any deceit found in his mouth? How then does he speak of my sins unless because he prays for our sins, and made our sins his own, in order that he might make his righteousness ours." Upon this Dr. Faber^c has not scrupled to assert that St. Augustine held the doctrine of Forensic Imputation. He says, that "though he deduced the doctrine from a text which will not bear him out, the doctrine itself is not the less the doctrine of St. Augustine." Since, however, it is clear, that even if we should be content to regard the Psalm as prophetically applicable to Christ, the words in question are not found in it, St. Augustine's boasted authority is reduced to the dimensions of a comment without a text,—an interpretation put upon words which never were written.

It ought to be no small objection with the Anglican clergy, that whether the doctrine of Forensic Imputation be well or ill founded, it certainly is not a doctrine of their Church. Whether

^c *The Primitive Doctrine of Justification*, lib. iv., page 148.

we look to the articles or the homilies, the collects, the prayers, or the services of the Church, all are alike utterly silent on the subject, and so far at least as they are concerned, we are not forbidden to place it in the same category with the belief in purgatory, as "a fond thing vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture." The Church teaches what Scripture teaches, neither more nor less, viz., the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith; that through the perfect righteousness and acceptable mediation of Christ, the sins of those who truly believe and repent are remitted, and they are thus, and only thus, esteemed or regarded as righteous. We find nothing to encourage the belief that the sins of believers are in any sense to be regarded as imputed or transferred to their Redeemer, or that his righteousness is to be considered as theirs. In the Communion service we approach the Eucharist not trusting in our own righteousness, or in any putative or forensic condition, but only in the manifold and great mercies of Christ. We affirm in the Articles "that Christ was made like unto us in all things, *sin only except*, from which he was *clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit*;" and that "we are accounted righteous before God only for the *merit* of our Lord and Saviour." In these passages is comprised all that the Church teaches, or consistently with Scripture could teach, on the subject.

If we should be satisfied that the belief in question is altogether erroneous, the origin of the error is perhaps not far to seek. It is a characteristic of our nature to search eagerly for the causes of the various phenomena which are presented to us. Not satisfied with the product, we must know of the process also; and it is to this irresistible desire, implanted by divine wisdom and beneficence, that we owe the triumphs which we have attained in science, and the arts of life.

But although there is no limit to human curiosity, the regions within which it may safely be exercised *are* limited, and hence those methods which are allowable and useful in physical science, are utterly unavailing for the discovery of truths relating to the Divine nature. We may examine the laws which regulate the chemistry and mechanism of the earth and its in-

habitants, and the social and economical conditions of mankind, but the nature and the motives of Him who ordained those laws, except so far as he has disclosed them, are alike shrouded in impenetrable mystery. Our own share in the great work of redemption,—faith and repentance,—is plainly made known—“*Enough for man to know*,” but when we presume to speculate upon the motives and condition of Him by whom the redemption was wrought, when we attempt to measure and weigh, and adjust and appreciate this transaction, by the standard of human conduct and human motives, when we argue about it from analogies drawn from human forms of procedure, whether actual, or (as we have seen in the present instances), altogether imaginary and impossible, we go far to incur the reproach due to those who rush in where angels fear to tread.

The transcendent and inscrutable character of the work of redemption, as regards our Lord's agency, and the consequent mischiefs and imperfections of the attempts so commonly and so complacently made to define it, have perhaps never been better shewn than by the late S. T. Coleridge in his *Aids to Reflection*. He says, “The article of redemption may be considered in a twofold relation. In relation to the antecedent, that is, the Redeemer's act, as the efficient cause and condition of redemption; and in relation to the consequent, that is,—the effect in and for the redeemed. Now it is the latter relation in which the subject is treated of, expounded, and set forth by St. Paul. The mysterious act, the operative cause, is *transcendent*. *Factum est*, and beyond the information contained in the enunciation of the fact, it can be characterized only by the consequences;” and again, “The causative act (in redemption) is a spiritual and *transcendent* mystery that passes all understanding.”

It may, perhaps, be said that the belief in Forensic Imputation, even if erroneous, is at least harmless—an enthusiastic extravagance—an error on the right side. But if any errors are on the right side, this is certainly not one of them, for no errors can be more disastrous than those which lie at the very foundation of the Christian faith. As Archbishop Whately has well said in his treatise on *Imputed Righteousness*, “Nothing is harmless which may put a stumbling-block in the way of any sincere Christian.

Nothing is harmless that tends to give an undue advantage to unbelievers—to disgust some with what they are told is the orthodox faith—and to furnish others with objections against it, by inserting doctrines which the Scriptures do not warrant. Nothing is harmless that leads to a depreciation, a dread, or a neglect of the divine instructions of the Apostle Paul, and such is most remarkably the case with the system I have now been considering.”

The Archbishop’s remarks in reprobation of the doctrine of Imputed Righteousness apply with equal, or indeed far greater, force to that of Imputed Guilt. For instance, what can tend to give an undue advantage to unbelievers, and to disgust some with what they are told is the orthodox faith—(if we understand that it comprises the doctrine of the Trinity)—than the Bishop of Peterborough’s assertion, that one person of the Trinity, “of one substance power and eternity” with the Father and the Holy Ghost,—God made man,—was regarded and punished as a malefactor by God the Father,—falling into his hands as a criminal in the power of the judge or executioner to endure ‘*the worst*,’ and to suffer pangs of remorse like those which tortured the traitor Judas?—Can that belief be harmless which involves conceptions of the Deity, worthy rather of the anthropomorphism of the Buddhist or Hindoo superstitions, than of the Christian faith?

J. W. F.

Explorations in Palestine.—Mr. Grove publishes a report, which he has just received from Lieut. Warren, R.E., who is conducting the explorations in Jerusalem for the Palestine Exploration Fund. At the Dead Sea he found with some difficulty the Ordnance Survey beach mark, which is in good preservation, but is covered up. The level of the sea is within a foot of what it was when Captain Wilson levelled there, but during the spring months it must have been 5ft. 6in. higher. Lieut. Warren has surveyed on the other side of Jordan about 400 square miles, which, with 600 to S.W. of Jerusalem, and 250 in the Jordan valley, will make in all 1250 square miles.

ON THE INVENTION OF THE ALPHABET.**BY THE REV. DR. BRUCKNER.**

IN the year 1828 Champollion the younger first landed on the Egyptian coast for the purpose of deciphering the hieroglyphics. He had been inclined to such studies from his youth up, and he had been instructed by his brother, Champollion-Figeac, besides which, he was supported in the most liberal manner by the French government. Champollion fulfilled the destiny of his life with astonishing rapidity, for during only sixteen months' residence he accomplished the complete decipherment of those sacred signs, a task which many learned men had hitherto tried in vain, and which most of them had abandoned in despair. As if by magic, he triumphed over the mysterious meed of wonders, and seized, at the foot of the Pyramids, a more brilliant and abiding victory in the realm of letters, than thirty years earlier his countryman Napoleon had won at the head of his army and with his whole fleet.

Scarcely returned to Paris, he had just time to arrange his papers, and prepare them for the press, when death snatched him away. He died in 1832, in the forty-first year of his age. His great work, which, with reference to his brief sojourn in his native land, he pathetically called "his visiting card to posterity," was given to the world by his brother, at the command of the then Minister of Public Instruction, Mons. Guizot. It was entitled *The Egyptian Grammar, in three parts*, and was first published in 1836 or 1837. It is a work of such surpassing merit, that it will ever remain the fountain of knowledge as to our acquaintance with that language. He was followed by the Italian, Rosellini, who collected together the monuments of Egypt, sacred, regal, and domestic; whilst the honour of Germany was vindicated by our countryman Richard Lepsius, who, through the munificence of the late King Frederick William IV. of Prussia, in the year 1841, undertook a similar scientific expedition into the land of Ham.

We give this short introduction because the invention of the alphabet, which forms our present subject, is intimately connected with the decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphics.

It is only by their help that we can reach our desired goal, and trace out from the commencement those steps by which the human mind arrived at such an important discovery.

To this end, we must review the Egyptian monumental inscriptions, and we shall do it as briefly as possible, under the guidance of an accomplished leader, to whom we owe a tribute of thanks, which, were he living, he would probably have forbidden, but which now must be awarded to him as his just due. Gesenius, under the head "Palæography," in the *Halle Encyclopædia of Sciences*, instituted some valuable researches into this matter. It was one of the last labours of this distinguished scholar, written in his best manner, clear, instructive, acute, a model of German industry and scholarship; but still without any certain results. Founded upon his suggestions, therefore, we pursue our own theory in the following inquiry.

1. All writing may be called a representation of speech to the eyes, in contrast to what we receive by the ears, and it has commenced by endeavours to delineate the object itself. Thus the lion was figured as near to nature as the artist's talent permitted, and such sign-writing, directly imitating nature, is called the hieroglyphic or Kyriological writing proper.

We may compare with this the sound-imitating element (*onomatopæia*), such as the names of animals in the mouths of children, which in every tongue are the first and earliest attempts at speech. In this simple and natural style the picture will represent the word, and the group will compose the sentence. The knowledge of any particular language, therefore, is unnecessary to comprehend the meaning, for it presents itself visibly to the understanding without the intervention of words. To this class belongs the oldest and largest part of the Egyptian hieroglyphics—the original writing of the Chinese, and to this day of the native Mexicans.

2. Men must advance a step further when they wish to express in writing, not merely visible objects, but abstract ideas, which do not admit of material representation. When such ideas could be naturally connected with some outward form, the manner was to make the pictured object subordinate to them, as, for example, to take the lion for the symbol of strength or domi-

nion. This originated a second order of hieroglyphs,—the symbolical. No special language is needed to understand this form either, but the intellect of the reader must be exercised to abstract the inward meaning from the outward delineation. The Egyptians pursued this method with great acuteness, and very often with a profound knowledge of nature, as evidenced by their symbols. To this class belongs also a small portion of Chinese hierography.

3. Thus with this second class of signs a new method was discovered to express an immense number of words, but still there always remained over a large number which could not thus be expressed, and for them arbitrary signs had to be invented, forming the *third* class of hieroglyphics. This kind of writing is the form commonly used by the Chinese. They have from twenty thousand to thirty thousand arbitrary signs, with two hundred and fourteen *root* signs, through which all the others must be interpreted.

As characteristics of these three forms of writing, we give the following examples from the Egyptians:—The crocodile symbolizes viciousness; the hawk, swiftness; the fly, impudence; the sparrow (the plague of their fields) wickedness. True to nature are the following:—The bee, as the emblem of sovereignty, because it cannot exist without a queen; the vulture, for maternal love, because of its tender care for its young; the falcon, for sublimity, because of its soaring flight; the eagle's eye, for penetration and contemplation, because it was believed that this bird could gaze upon the sun undazzled.

Sometimes a part was put for the whole, as, for example, an ox's head for oxen; two mailed arms for a warrior. Or the cause was put for the effect, as the sun for day; the sky and stars for night. Or the effect might be put for the cause, as a smoking chimney for fire; the tool sometimes stands for the workman, such as pencil and palette for the painter; an eye for a watchman; two wine vessels for wine; a beehive for honey; the king is symbolized by his sceptre; the priest by a vase pouring out libations. Amongst the Chinese, a woman with a broom betokens a matron; a man upon a mountain a hermit.

With another class the reason for selection is either doubtful

or arbitrary, or unknown, such as an ostrich feather for justice, perhaps because all the feathers of the ostrich are said to be of equal strength ; the palm branch for the year, probably because the palm every year puts forth twelve shoots.

The flower of the lotus is the emblem of Upper Egypt, and the papyrus stems for Lower Egypt ; a cross with a handle stands for the sign of life, and, united with a substantive, becomes the adjective "living," *e.g.*, reposing on the breast of a deity, it means "the living God ;" a child or a palm reed signifies "young," and a white onion means "white."

The dual number in Egyptian is expressed by doubling the sign, or by two vertical strokes ; the plural by three signs, or three vertical strokes ; three men stand for mankind.

Minerals are expressed by strokes, which are arranged in groups for greater convenience ; a third or fourth part is indicated by the number with a mouth added, to express a portion ; the feminine gender is shewn by the section of a circle, and sometimes by an egg.

The Egyptian tongue has no declensions, therefore, the relation of its words must be gathered from their position. The nominative always stands first, the genitive follows immediately, then comes the verb, and, lastly, the objective. The comparative is formed by the repetition of the adjective ; the superlative by a threefold reiteration as great-great-great.

To particularize a few of the verbs :—two eyes mean "to see ;" an outstretched hand, "to give." As a substantive it would signify "liberality ;" and a closed hand "avarice," as in 1 Kings x. 13, "Solomon gave her *out of hand*, *i.e.*, according to the liberality of the king ;" a figure walking means "to walk," and if reversed, "to return ;" a figure kneeling, with uplifted hands, means "to supplicate ;" three men following each other, "to follow ;" a man with a stick, "to chastise ;" an arm with a club, "to be strong ;" two arms with a sword and shield, "to fight ;" a star denotes "to honour ;" an eagle's eye, "to contemplate."

To distinguish between the signs proper and the signs symbolic—that is, to decide when the picture of an eye denotes the member, and when it means a watchman—other marks have to be added, which Champollion named determinatives : such, for

instance, is a thigh bone, for all bodily members; an animal's skin for quadrupeds; a goose for birds; a tree for trees; three grains of gold for metals; and water for liquids. Even amongst ourselves we use something similar for our symbolical and arbitrary signs,—as a cross † for one dead; a cross, heart, and anchor, for faith, hope, and charity; we have the symbolical science of heraldry, and the language of flowers, this last resting upon natural expression. The language of the deaf and dumb consists of symbols, and that of the telegraph of arbitrary signs; still more analagous are medical signs and those of the kalendar, being a mixture of the sign proper, the symbolical, and the arbitrary, which to this day are as mysterious and incomprehensible to the uninitiated as the Egyptian hieroglyphics.

4. The above threefold kinds of writing, which, in reference to their forms, we have called picture writing, and to their meaning, symbol writing, must in use have encountered many difficulties. In the first place, they were very intractable, and whilst they appear almost entirely upon pyramids, obelisks, and other public monuments, they become unrecognizable, through abbreviations and adaptations, as cursive writing. In this form they appear in rituals, of which the famous Book of the Dead, preserved in Pisa, is an instance; also for contracts and matters of ordinary business. The material for these was usually papyrus with coloured ink, and this abbreviated character was called the demotic or vulgar writing (*grammata rustica*).

Picture writing then must always be liable to a species of uncertainty, because the same emblem is sometimes employed literally, and sometimes figuratively. It must also always remain meagre and incomplete, because the most important parts of speech, nouns, pronouns, and particles can never be definitely expressed. Their flexion, gender, and number cannot be given, without which no language, and still more, no written language, can be made fully intelligible.

The Chinese, to surmount this difficulty, have invented arbitrary signs for the pronouns and particles, by which they increase their obscurity. The substantive pronouns, however, they have divided into vocables, for which they have proper signs. For instance, Christ is pronounced in Chinese Chi-li-si-tu-se.

The Egyptians, however, who were obliged to strive after the greatest possible exactness, because the names of their own kings and provinces were engraved upon the monuments, found themselves obliged to invent a new and surer method of expression, and thus were driven to devise a new cheirography. They applied Cæsar's maxim of warfare, "divide et impera," to their words, and divided them, not into syllables like the Chinese, but into *sounds*, which they expressed in a simple and skilful manner. For every sound they choose a particular sign, the name of which began with this sound, so that the sign does not stand for the whole word, but only for a single sound ; example, lion, *loboi*, gives the L ; hand, *Thoth*, gives the T, and so on. This make the fourth, and by far the most important, class of hieroglyphics, viz., the *phonetic*.

Thus we have arrived at a completely new kind of writing, which, in respect of its quality, we call phonetic ; and, in respect of its form, alphabetic or orthographic, the derivations of which from picture writing can no longer be denied.* Yet simple and easy as the transition from the one to the other was, it took place late in time, and only when it had become an absolute necessity. It is in harmony with this law, that through the Shemitic alphabet the key should be found to decipher the Egyptian hieroglyphics. Apparently, when Champollion went to Egypt, it was his intention to apply this law to the engraved characters ; and by means of it he arrived at his great discovery. This, however, does not detract from his originality.

At first several signs were used to express the same sound ; example, for R., a mouth, a pomegranate, or tears, all which words in Egyptian begin with R. The earliest grammar presents us with an alphabet of two hundred and twenty-one sounds, of which forty-eight are vowels or diphthongs ; but gradually these became contracted to two fixed characters for each sound, and

* We would here call attention to the analogy which exists between the invention of signs for sound and the discovery of printing. Long previously had mankind been acquainted with woodcuts to represent scenes or images. Sometimes these cuts had names or sentences written over or under them. The great discovery consisted in this, that at last single letters were found out of which every required word could be composed.

Lepsius has again reduced this ponderous alphabet to thirty sounds, expressing twelve of our consonants and three vowels.

Hieroglyphical writing, then, consists of a mixture of the proper, the symbolical, the arbitrary, and the phonetic signs, as we find them upon monuments or in papyri, and the same word is often repeated twice for the sake of plainness, being written once properly or symbolically, and the second time in separate letters, as, for instance, "the king," expressed by his symbol the bee, and then written phonetically. So far the Egyptians advanced towards the invention of an alphabet and no further. They did not, like the Chinese, go half way. They stopped short of the goal altogether, and the last step which they had to make, in order to appropriate to themselves the merit of the invention of the alphabet, viz., the rejection of all the hieroglyphs difficult to learn or use, and the selection of a few fixed signs for sound, they left unsurmounted.

The results of their newly deciphered and most interesting literature are not yet fully developed, and the learned will long have to employ upon it their diligence and acuteness, even after our means of information have become more accessible and numerous. We shall certainly derive from them much new information as to the language, archæology, and history of many ancient peoples, but they will scarcely fulfil the expectations which were at first excited by those newly opened treasures, and, least of all, will they impose upon theological students as they did upon the late Chevalier Bunsen, who sought to rectify the whole history and chronology of the Bible by the Pyramids. Their decipherment was in itself a triumph of genius, and we believe it enables us to trace to a new source the invention of the alphabet, to which subject we now return.

1. The oldest alphabet known to us is the Phœnician, as we find it upon coins, votive tablets, signets, and other remains (to be seen in Gesenius's *Monumenta Phœnicia*, Leipzig, 1840). It rests upon the law above stated, *i. e.*, it uses a figure for the sound with which the word begins, such as the imperfect picture of an ox (Phœnic. aleph) for an *a*, the figure of a tent (beth) for *β*, the rough sketch of a camel's neck (gimel) for *γ*, and so on. In short, it is composed entirely of Phœnician signs,

whence we trace its development from the hieroglyphics, and deduce the proposition that the inventor of this alphabet was acquainted with the Egyptian system of writing, and therefore that he was instructed in it by Egyptian masters. No other nation besides the Egyptian is likely to have *originated* the same idea, and no alphabet has ever been discovered amongst any other people which we could call their independent invention.

2. This Phœnician alphabet is, in figure, name, value, and order of letters, the same as the old Hebrew, and it is the common belief that the square letter or Chaldee alphabet now used in our Bibles was derived from it. It may be, however, that these latter are the older of the two, for they give the characters in a more precise manner, and there appears to be the same relation between the (so-called) old Hebrew and Phœnician form, as between the hieroglyphics upon the monuments and the demotic writing. The elaborate square letters give the impression of being the original for the exclusive use of sacred documents and tables of law. The old Hebrew, which we find upon the coins of the Maccabees, signets, and so forth, is more like a cursive writing for the ordinary affairs of life.

If we consider the fanatical strictness of the Jews after their exile, it is scarcely credible that their holy records should then for the first time have been written in a character which they learned from their oppressors. That the coins (200 A.C.) should be older than the oldest codices which we possess of the Old Testament proves nothing, for the rolls were always buried as soon as they ceased to be used in the synagogue. But, however this may be, it is certain that all other alphabets have sprung from this one, and that it is the mother of the Hebrew as well as of the Greek and Roman. According to Herodotus, Pliny, and Plutarch, Cadmus brought letters from the Phœnicians to the Greeks, and this tradition is elevated to the dignity of fact from the evident relation which the one bears to the other.

2. The second peculiarity which strikes us in this ancient alphabet is its richness, for many delicacies of pronunciation are expressed in it by signs, which are lost in the borrowed alphabets. Whilst the Egyptians contented themselves with fifteen sounds, the Phœnicians had twenty-two. Of these, five are sibilants

from lisping *s* to harsh *sch*, and four are gutturals, from the softest aspirate to the harshest *ch*. There are, besides, many sounds accompanied by a gentle aspirate, so that the language for which they were composed must have been full of life and expression. Herder says of it, "The Hebrew tongue pants and breathes; the Greek sounds and thrills." In short, it is the *Shemitic character of the alphabet* which is stamped upon it, and which has never been questioned. It is adapted to a Shemitic organ of speech, and the inventor must surely have belonged to a Shemitic people.^b

3. If we examine this alphabet more minutely, we shall find that it has been constructed so as carefully to avoid difficulties in reading and writing. Let us inquire from what objects the several letters have been taken, and we shall see in them tokens of the foresight and consideration of the inventor. He selects for his letters those members of a man's person which serve for speaking and writing, such as the thinking head, often divided into forehead and hind head, the mouth, the teeth, the eye, and above all, the hand, chiefly the writing hand (*kaph*), and perhaps teth, which may be derived from the Egyptian *Tot*, meaning also "the hand."

The next objects selected were those which betokened his life and occupations, *i.e.*, those which appertain to a shepherd's life. We have the tent and its divisions; the door; the barred window; the pole and the tent pin. Also his herds of oxen and camels. Lastly, the instruments and accompaniments of such a calling; the fold; the shepherd's staff; the weapons to drive away wild beasts; the water pitcher, which he carried with him into the desert; and the cross with which he marked his sheep. If to these we add the water, with its inhabitants, the fish, and the implements by which they are caught, we have here the sounds of the Hebrew alphabet. Of these again twelve belong to pastoral life, seven to the members requisite for speaking and writing, and three to fishing, as if in memory of Egypt and its rivers teeming with fish.

^b Compare the references in Gesenius, especially upon the changes which the Greeks were compelled to make in the alphabet which they borrowed, in order to suit it to their pronunciation.

From these premises we deduce our third position, viz.—that the alphabet was not invented by a commercial people like the Phœnicians,—for then we should have found in it the ship with its divisions,—but by a pastoral, and that its inventor was a shepherd. By this development from the picture ideal was formed a complete alphabet of twenty-two comprehensible and pleasing figures, sufficient to express every sound, and give voice to every thought. Its inventor may be called the father of eloquence. In his hand the graving stylus has become a sceptre with which he rules undisputed over sounds, and the reed a magic staff with which to warm, to instruct, and to cheer the spirits. To us he has transmitted the pen which, like a wing, enables our ideas to fly over time and space.

The establishment of an alphabet is the first great advance towards freedom of mind, and its inventor must be reckoned amongst the greatest of human benefactors. The arrangement of it rests upon a base existing in nature, and we see what a magnificent structure he has erected upon it. To whom, then, is this signal merit due, and from what nation did he spring? or has he vanished from the world traceless and unknown? On this point we pass over the opinions of ancient authors. Gesenius adduces them only to refute them; but it is clear that in this our day we ought to have more light upon the subject than was possible to Cicero and the ancients, because they could not read the hieroglyphics. Gesenius concludes with these words:—“Shall all these indications not point our researches to Hebrew writers settled in Egypt?” Yea, verily; but, like the Egyptians, he has halted on the very threshold, and forborne to take the final step. He adds,—“Upon this head it is impossible to assert anything positive.” Now, we thank him that he has left open to us the right to answer this question, for it is so apparent that every well-instructed scholar may hazard a reply.

We have seen that the alphabet was developed from Egyptian hieroglyphics, and that it was composed by a Shemite who had

* A white man having opened a letter before some savages, and told them news out of it, which he had received from distant friends, they believed that a spirit had been imprisoned in the paper, which was now set free, and communicated with him.

led a shepherd's life. In what celebrated man do these three marks meet? Surely in Moses above all others; "trained in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," the adopted son of the king's daughter; and we believe that it was he who invented the phonetic alphabet for the Hebrews, and the continuous nations. He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and drew in the speech of his parents with his mother's milk. He often afterwards went out to see his brethren (Exod. ii. 11), and to learn their manners of life; after which he passed forty years of patience and contemplation as a shepherd in the wilderness of Midian. Amongst every other people to whom the invention of the alphabet is attributed, at least one of the foregoing marks is wanting, whilst they all exactly coincide in Moses.^d

4. The direct testimony of Eupolemus, preserved in Eusebius, is also exceedingly to the purpose:—"He has handed down to us many things about Moses worthy to be considered; for instance, that he was a first-rate scholar, and that *he was the first who taught letters to the Jews*; from them they were taken by the Phœnicians, and from the Phœnicians by the Greeks. He was also the first who gave written laws to the Jews."^e

Gesenius speaks slightly of this historical testimony—but he does not venture to deny it—along with many other opinions of the ancients; indeed, he could not accept it according to his view of the sacred canon, because then the genuineness of the Pentateuch and the truth of the biblical history must be accepted also. We are far from stating this as a reproach; on the contrary, we honour his memory as a man who has done much good,

^d So much may be conceded by the most cautious scholar, who must confess that it is at least probable that Moses may have been the inventor of the first alphabet, and before *that* of the newest Egyptian phonetic hieroglyphics, for both go upon the same principle, and appear to be kindred ideas of the same mind. In Acts vii. 22 it is written, "Moses was mighty in words and deeds," which alludes not to his miracles, already narrated in ch. v. ver. 36, but to his worldly influence and valiant acts in the land of Ham. Josephus tells us that he was a victorious general, triumphing for Pharaoh over the Ethiopians.

^e See Eusebius, lib. ix., c. 26, quotation from *Alexander Polyhistor*.—"Idem quoque plurima de Mose habet auditu digna Mosem (inquit) narrat Eupolemus primum sapientem fuisse, Judæisque primum literas tradidisse, a quibus eas Phœnices, ut a Phœnicibus Græci acceperint.—Eundemque Judæis leges principem condidisse (Franciscus Vigerus, Edit. Paris: 1628).

and been extremely useful as a critical scholar. It is, however, clear that the existence of such a tradition should have some weight with impartial inquirers, and is fitted to excite reflection and stir up to further research.

5. To the internal evidences from the compilation of the alphabet itself, and the external testimony of tradition, we may add a fifth argument, which is theological, or rather, perhaps, teleological. It will have influence with those who believe in the rule of God upon earth, and who are convinced that every great advance has taken place under his own immediate guidance. The sixty-six enumerated descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had increased to two millions of souls during their sojourn of four hundred and thirty years in the fruitful and cultivated land of Egypt. A further step was then needed to fulfil the divine promise. It was time to call the first-born son of God out of the land of bondage, to fashion him by God's laws, and to settle him in the promised land. This, however, could not be done without the acquisition of an easily learned and easily used writing. Hitherto all the knowledge of the patriarchs and the revelations of God seem to have been transmitted by oral tradition, a method possible in those times, because life was simple, the intellectual powers were concentrated, and traditions flowed in an even stream; besides, they probably had in use signs for numbers to assist the memory. But now a new era had begun: family annals were becoming national history; the stream of revelation was flowing more abundantly; the law, with its fulness of ritual, was added; and the memory could never have retained all these; they must necessarily be committed to writing. Very probably neither the Egyptians, sunk in their worship of nature, nor any other heathens were to have the honour of laying this corner-stone in God's kingdom by the discovery of writing. The man whom he had selected and educated to be his ambassador and the mediator of his law, was to be the sacred penman of the divine acts and polity. The inventor of letters must certainly have preceded the giving of the law upon Mount Sinai; and without the former the latter could have had no permanent existence. If, therefore, Moses fixed his alphabet in the Arabian wilderness, he there took the first step

towards fulfilling his high calling, and to accomplish thereby, though unconsciously, more for the freedom of his people than he had previously done by his arbitrary slaughter of the Egyptian.

Who is not here impressed by the striking analogy which appears to the invention of printing two thousand years later, and that great event of the Reformation to which it led, and without which it could not have been accomplished? Never could Christendom have been flooded with the new light, and fed in continuous streams with divine knowledge, if the printing press had not been discovered; without this, Luther's impassioned theses would have died away upon the spot where they were uttered. But, through printing, the thunderbolts which he launched from the cathedral at Wittemberg resounded all over the Christian world. Through this he could incessantly renew and send forth his artillery; through this he could again place the darkened light of the Holy Scripture upon its candlestick; he could become the founder of a new language and a new literature, and he could rouse men's spirits to an activity and a freedom which had never been known since the days of the apostles. We cannot doubt that this stupendous discovery, which earlier centuries groped for in vain, has not only been brought about by God's providence precisely in our day, but that it is also an instrument in his hand to effect something new upon the earth which is to work for the advance of his kingdom. If the inventor of the alphabet was Moses, we must believe that his invention was an inspiration from the Most High; and certainly he consecrated it to the sublimest uses, in that he employed it to inscribe the great acts of the Lord. The books of Moses are not the oldest writings in the world, but they are the oldest in any regular alphabet. That the wonderful discoveries of our day are means in the hands of God to prepare and forward some of his hidden purposes, only blindness or incapacity can deny. It is the work of the Spirit of Christ, which breathed through his people, awakening them to the signs of the times, and enabling them to perceive the foreshadowings of the future. In these new discoveries we must not merely recognize a victory won by man's intellect over the forces of nature, or instruments to increase the well-being of mankind, but we must regard them as

divine dispensations, a gracious development of God's counsels, and a mighty progress in his kingdom, which will keep pace with it, and be its consequence. They include the germ of those things which are to come. Isaiah gives us the result in the concluding words of his prophecy:—"For the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." It is, in one word, the second coming of Christ, for which the spirits of men are to be prepared; for them the ways are made smooth, and the destinies of Christendom are carried forward by steam and electric fire. The old world is perishing, and the new world is regenerating by fire; light is conquering the darkness, and light is of God and with God. All theology, all interpretation, all conjecture as to the events and signs of the times are vain unless we can see in them God's providence in the government of the world. Many a time has the church expected and hoped for the coming of the Lord. Men have prophesied of it and calculated for it from the days of the apostles down to the last seer; but never yet has a time been so replete with signs and harbingers as our own.

As surely as the invention of the alphabet stands in connection with the giving of the law on Sinai, and printing with the spread of the Reformation, as parts of a divine plan, so surely is the second coming heralded and prepared by the stupendous discoveries of steam and electricity. His first coming was prepared in a manner somewhat similar by the wide-spread empire of the Romans uniting so large a portion of the earth under one rule. The general multitude may pass by these things with indifference, or consider them only in a material point of view, but we are persuaded that unprejudiced and reflecting Christians will sympathize with us, seeing that we pretend to no special illumination, but merely claim the free exercise of that understanding which the Lord has at all times promised to bestow upon his church. Our object is to comprehend his acts, to discover his will, and from the past to elucidate the present, and glance into the future. "Therefore, when these things begin to come to pass, lift up your eyes and look, for your redemption draweth nigh."

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We wish our readers to understand that we cannot be held responsible for the opinions of our contributors and correspondents. The utmost we can do is to keep a careful eye upon the literary character of their communications, and to see that they do not transcend the limits of fair criticism and lawful inquiry.]

THE TWO DARIUSES (?)

A WORK has been recently published under the title of *Messiah the Prince*, containing remarks on the views of Dr. Pusey and others, with a treatise on the sabbatical years and jubilees. Of two respectable journals, one^a considers that a clearer and fuller exposition of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks could not be devised: the other^b says, "This is decidedly an able book . . . We think the author has proved his great historical point, 'that Daniel's master was no other than the great Persian king DARIUS, the son of Hystaspes, one of the best known kings in Persian history. There is some truth in the statement that Dr. Pusey, who had the key to unlock the mystery (of the Seventy Weeks), cast it away by surrendering himself into the hands of Prideaux.'"

The writer of this paper has not had an opportunity of perusing the work in question, but he has read carefully two able critical notices^c of it in the *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*. This critic also considers that it must be conceded that the Darius of the Book of Daniel, and the Darius of the Books of Ezra, Haggai, and Zechariah, are one and the same. The writer's object in drawing up this paper is merely to endeavour to shew the fallacy of this view, and to point out certain strong, or even apparently insuperable, objections to the proposed identification of the two Dariuses. It would seem that Dr. Pusey does not accept this identification. We are aware that the very learned Hebrew professor is not infallible; yet that such a profound scholar, after more than twenty-five years' thoughtful study of the Book of Daniel, should not have discovered that the Darius of Daniel is identical with the Darius of Ezra, is doubtless a circumstance calculated to make us cautious how we consent to accept the proposed identity.

^a *London Review*.

^b *Ecclesiastic*.

^c October, 1866, p. 362; and April, 1867, p. 129.

There are certain passages in the Book of Daniel which must be serious obstacles in the way of Dr. Pusey's receiving this theory. Thus we have in Dan. i. 21, "And Daniel continued unto the first year of king Cyrus." And again (vi. 28), "So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius (the Mede), and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian." And again (x. 1), "In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a thing was revealed to Daniel." On these passages the author of the critical notices in the *Journal of Prophecy* remarks,— "Hence it follows that the reign of Cyrus *followed* that of Darius. The author of *Messiah the Prince* disposes of the difficulty by supposing that the passages in Daniel which speak of Cyrus are a forged addition to the book. We entirely dissent from this view."

How then can he, with such entire dissent, hold the identity of the two Dariuses? He considers "that the actions of two distinct persons have been confounded together by historians under the name of Cyrus." That is, this writer is of opinion that the Cyrus of Daniel is not to be identified with the Cyrus of Ezra. Accordingly, he supposes that in Daniel and Ezra we have one Darius, and two Cyruses. We shall not wonder if Dr. Pusey (though he has shewn in his *Eirenikon* that he can uphold what many thoughtful and sensible persons find it impossible to receive) decline accepting the theory that there are, in Daniel and Ezra, one Darius and two Cyruses. Nor will he, we presume, admit that the three passages cited above, are "a forged addition to the Book of Daniel." We should not think it fair and reasonable to deal thus with Herodotus and Thucydides, Livy and Tacitus—to reject, as supposed forgeries, passages that oppose a favourite theory which we may sincerely believe to be true, and for no other valid reason than their opposition to that theory. We must not forget that the Jews carefully looked to the preservation of the integrity of the text of the books which constituted their *Hagiographa*. There does appear to have been some carelessness of transcription towards the close of the Book of Nehemiah. But when we consider (judging from the words of our Lord in the New Testament) in how great reverence the Book of Daniel was held among the Jews, we may consider it as one of the *last* of the books in the *Hagiographa* likely to be disfigured and profaned by forged interpolations.

Granting Daniel i. 21 and vi. 28 to have been added after the death of the prophet, it is very far from following that they are not authentic historical truths. Of two such illustrious personages as Daniel and Cyrus, we cannot doubt that *authentic* historical tradi-

tions would long survive among the Jews, both in *Jerusalem* and *Babylon*: and if the two passages were added before the death of Nehemiah (whose decease occurred later than a century after the third year of Cyrus), we may reasonably conclude that they assert what is historically true. And thus they are of importance to the devout Christian. They furnish strong ground for believing that Daniel was in the favour and confidence of the great Cyrus, when in the first year of his reign over Babylon and Jerusalem he publicly decreed the restoration of the captive Jews, and the rebuilding of their temple (Ezra i. 1, etc.), and that it was through the instrumentality of Daniel's shewing to the king the prediction of Isaiah, that the most high God moved Cyrus to take such a warm interest in the Jews and their temple. They also indirectly confirm other portions of Daniel's book. Had Daniel been an obscure Jew, it is not likely Cyrus would have paid any serious attention to him. Granting that Daniel had been the faithful, trusted, and honoured prime minister of Darius the Mede, what is more natural than that Cyrus should apply to him for information about the Chaldean kingdom, and be won to esteem him. And if it be true that in the preceding year, the prophet had been miraculously delivered from the den of lions, and that Darius the Mede had made a public decree commanding all his subjects to tremble, and fear before the GOD OF DANIEL, Cyrus would hear of this, and thus be prepared to regard Daniel as one highly favoured of heaven, and to accept, on Daniel's assurance, the words of Isaiah as a divinely inspired prediction.

The passage at the end of the first chapter seems to teach us that after the first year of Cyrus Daniel had *no personal intercourse* with Cyrus, and this agrees with the testimony of secular history, that after the capture of Babylon, Cyrus engaged in fresh schemes of ambition and conquest. We should, indeed, have expected to have received from Daniel himself, at least, a brief allusion to what passed between him and Cyrus, when the latter took possession of the Chaldean realm. The record of Holy Writ, as gathered from Isaiah's predictions, agrees with Herodotus (and we may perhaps add Ctesias) in making Cyrus to be the conqueror of Babylon; no earthly potentate being superior or equal to him at the time. We, therefore, conclude that on the night in which Belshazzar, after having been divinely warned, through Daniel's interpretation of the hand-writing on the wall, that his reign was come to an end, and his kingdom given to the Medes and Persians, was himself slain, that it was Cyrus who entered Babylon as a conqueror, at the head of the Medo-Persian

host. It is contrary, not only to the predictions of Isaiah, but still more so to the testimony of Herodotus and Ctesias, to suppose that any Mede or Persian was equal, much less superior, to Cyrus. We seem, therefore, forbidden by all these three authorities to think that Darius the Mede could take possession of the realm of Chaldea *without the consent of Cyrus*. Cyrus as the conqueror, and as sovereign of Media and Persia, could have taken possession of Babylon and Chaldea immediately on the death of Belshazzar, as he had assumed the sovereignty of Media on the overthrow and deposition of Astyages. As he had no intention of making Babylon the metropolis of his vast empire, instead of appointing a governor or viceroy, as might have been expected, he decided to give the Chaldean realm to Darius, son of Ahasuerus of the seed of the Medes.

If the one hundred and twenty^d provinces over which Darius the Mede reigned included only the dominions of Belshazzar, and Darius became king very shortly after the death of Belshazzar, we see abundant reason why the new king should have made Daniel one of his chief ministers. Cyrus and Darius being together at Babylon, would early learn Daniel's interpretation of the handwriting on the wall, and that Belshazzar had, in consequence thereof, proclaimed Daniel to be the third ruler in the kingdom. They would at once summon the prophet into their presence. They would learn from him that he had been very high in office under Nebuchadnezzar, and would come to the conclusion that Darius could not find in Babylon a wiser or more trustworthy counsellor than this aged Hebrew. The testimony of Herodotus and Ctesias to the thorough subjugation of Media under the supremacy of Cyrus, when he overthrew and deposed Astyages, appears peremptorily to forbid the idea that Darius the Mede was the independent king of Media when he took the realm of the Chaldeans. Nor is it likely that at the age of sixty he would leave Ecbatana, the royal city and palace of his fathers, to reside at Babylon; and even Josephus (probably thinking that Daniel's Darius was Xenophon's Cyaxares) makes Darius return into Media after the conquest of Babylon.

The most natural and obvious inference from the narrative of Daniel is, that Darius, on ascending Belshazzar's vacant throne,

^d In Dan. vi. 1 it is said—"Darius set over the kingdom (of Chaldea) one hundred and twenty *princes*." It is naturally inferred from this, that the kingdom was divided into one hundred and twenty *provinces*, which may have been of much smaller dimensions than the provinces into which the vast Persian empire was divided under Ahasuerus. See Esther i. 1.

took up his residence in Babylon, and that it was there that the prophet was cast into the den of lions for praying three times a day with his window open towards Jerusalem. Daniel was competent to be the chief minister under a king of Chaldea, but not equally so to be chief minister of a king whose dominions included Media as well as Chaldea.

We have digressed further than we intended; and have not yet noticed the assumption that the name of Cyrus in Dan. x. 1 is a forged addition or a transcriber's error. And yet the text as it stands may be regarded as strikingly consistent with the narrative of Ezra. The attempt of the Samaritans to interrupt the rebuilding of the temple, and to intrigue with the officials of Cyrus against the Jews, would reach the ear of Daniel in the *third* year of Cyrus, and account for his mourning and fasting three weeks. At that time Cyrus was far away, and the prophet had no opportunity of interceding with Cyrus in behalf of the Jews and their temple. We think that the text of Dan. x. 1 is correct as it now stands, and that i. 21 and vi. 28 contain authentic historical truth, and were not improbably added by Ezra—that the Cyrus of Daniel is identical with the Cyrus of Ezra—and that the order of the three kings of Babylon is, Darius the Mede, Cyrus, Darius the son of Hystaspes, not forgetting that two kings, the latter a usurper, intervened between Cyrus and Darius Hystaspes.

Jewish historical and legendary traditions are both very unfavourable to the proposed identification. We have the historical tradition in Josephus, who distinctly states that Darius the Mede preceded Cyrus in the sovereignty of Babylon. We have the Jewish legendary tradition, both in Josephus and the Apocrypha. Combining these two into one legend, we are taught that, after *residing some time at Jerusalem* as governor of the returned Jews, to which office he had been appointed by Cyrus, Zerubbabel travelled from Jerusalem to the Persian court, as soon as he heard of the accession of Darius Hystaspes to the throne, with whom he had formerly been on terms of personal friendship. He was treated by the king with consideration and regard, and sent back with a large company of Jews to Jerusalem. Neither of these writers make any mention of the name of Daniel in connection with the Darius of Zerubbabel, and this may shew that neither of them had any idea that this Darius was to be identified with the Darius of Daniel.

We now quote from another writer in the *Journal of Prophecy* the following passage:—"Ezra speaks of the second year of a Darius

whom he calls king of Persia and king of Assyria. The author of *Messiah the Prince* identifies this Darius with Daniel's Darius the Median; and he holds that Ezra's 'second year of Darius' was the second year of the Median Darius, *i. e.*, the year immediately following that in which Daniel had been delivered from the den of lions. If so, at the very time when Tatnai and Shethar-boznai were endeavouring to compel Zerubbabel and the Jews to desist from the work of the temple, which had been resumed *at the divine command*, Daniel, the illustrious Hebrew prophet and statesman, was prime minister at the court of Darius, no other subject being so high in the esteem and confidence of that sovereign. *Nor would any other earthly object be so near the prophet's heart as the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem.*

"On this strange hypothesis we seem called on to believe that Daniel, during probably a year and a half, had never once named the decree of Cyrus concerning the Jewish temple to Ezra's Darius, and, indeed, that the illustrious prophet never openly exerted himself to render any important assistance to the returned Jews, while he was prime minister to Ezra's Darius.

"And is it not equally inexplicable that Zerubbabel and Jeshua should not have written to Daniel, when so high in the favour of Darius, earnestly urging him to exert himself in promoting the rebuilding of the temple of the God of their fathers. And how do all these perplexities and inconsistencies disappear, if only we suppose that the Darius of Daniel is not to be identified with the Darius of Ezra."

On the generally received view of the Book of Daniel, there are, as we have already observed, one or two agreements with the Book of Ezra not undeserving of notice. "Daniel continued unto the first year of Cyrus." Darius the Mede no longer residing as king in Babylon, Cyrus, having annexed Babylon to his own Persian Empire, would establish a governor there; and Daniel, bending under the load of years, his services no longer needed, would withdraw into peaceful and secure retirement. And Cyrus himself, being far away, absorbed in his schemes of ambition and conquest, could not be reached by the Jews or by Daniel. This may be a sufficient reason why we read of no public application on the part of Zerubbabel and Jeshua to Daniel, when the Samaritan colonists began to obstruct the work of rebuilding the temple. This obstruction would seem to have taken place about the close of the *second* year of Cyrus. The tidings would speedily reach Daniel, and affect his

heart with sadness and disquietude; and this will account for his "three weeks of mourning" in the *third* year of Cyrus, mentioned in x. 1, 2.

We now proceed to make a second quotation from the paper from which one extract has already been laid before the reader. "According to the theory of the author of *Messiah the Prince*, the *first* year of Darius, *i. e.*, the year in which Daniel was miraculously delivered from the lions, was 493-2 B.C., and the *second* year, when the king received Tatnai's letter, and when he appears to be still ignorant of the decree of Cyrus concerning the temple, was 492-1. Let us transcribe, side by side, the two following extracts from Daniel and Ezra:—

"Supposed date of the decree here quoted, 493-2 B.C. 'Then Darius wrote unto all/ people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth, Peace be multiplied unto you. I make a decree, that in every dominion of my kingdom, *men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel*; for he is the living God, and stedfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end. He delivereth and rescueth, and worketh signs and wonders in heaven and earth, *who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions*' (Dan. vi. 28).

"In the year following cir. 492-1 (about a year before the battle of Marathon), Tatnai is supposed to have addressed the following request to Darius.—'Now, therefore, if it seem good to the king, let there be search made in the king's treasure house, which is there at Babylon, *whether it be so that a decree was made of Cyrus the king to build this house of God at Jerusalem*, and let the king send his pleasure to us concerning this matter.' Then Darius the king made a decree, and search was made in the house of the rolls, where the treasures were laid up in Babylon,' etc. (Ezra v. 17).

"If our author's theory be correct, how are we to account for the perplexing fact that king Darius in 493-2 B.C., cannot speak too highly of the God of Daniel, nay, he promulgates a decree commanding all his subjects to adore and tremble before him; whereas, in the very next year, 492-1, he appears never to have heard the name of Daniel or of Daniel's God, nor to have been aware of the decree of Cyrus concerning the temple until the letter of Tatnai called his attention to it. Is it conceivable (if the Darius of Daniel was indeed the Darius of Ezra) that Daniel, who loved Jerusalem as he loved his life, should not have gladly taken advantage of the strong impression produced on the mind of Darius, by the miraculous

/ Daniel gives us the genuine decree of the king, but in so doing, he is not to be understood as asserting that the Median Darius was king over "all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth."

deliverance from the lions, to bring about the early and vigorous resumption of the interrupted work of the house of God at Jerusalem?"

We have now to appeal to the prophets Haggai and Zechariah. In the early part of the first chapter of Haggai, the Most High brings a charge against the returned Jews, the terms of which are singularly unfavourable to the notion that the Darius of Ezra and Haggai is identical with the Darius of Daniel. The charge is, that the returned Jews reply to those who remonstrate with them on the neglect of an important duty, "*The time is not come, the time that the Lord's house should be built.*" Now this plea would have been simply absurd, if Daniel had been at that time the all-powerful and confidential minister of Darius. Zerubbabel and Jeshua could have urged, and the returned Jews could not have denied the plea, that Daniel's elevated position and influence at the monarch's court rendered that time most especially favourable for resuming the rebuilding of the temple.

We are next to appeal to the testimony of Zechariah. "Upon the four-and-twentieth day of the eleventh month, in the second year of Darius," they whom the Lord had sent to walk to and fro through the earth said to the angel of the Lord, "We have walked to and fro through the earth, and, behold, all the earth sitteth still, and is at rest." Now, if the Darius of Daniel is really identical with the Darius of Ezra, Haggai and Zechariah, and if he took the realm of the Chaldeans in 493-2 B.C., then in his second year, late in which Zechariah saw the vision, Darius and his courtiers were forming plans and making preparations for a formidable invasion of Greece, which was to terminate in the disastrous defeat at Marathon. Accordingly, we should not expect the heavenly messengers to bring back at such a time the pacific message, "*Behold all the earth sitteth still, and is at rest.*"

Upon the whole, we regard the testimony of Isaiah and Herodotus (and also that of Ctesias), who seem to describe Cyrus as the supreme Oriental potentate when he took Babylon; the Jewish historical and legendary tradition, as found in Josephus and the Apocrypha, and the statements of the Books of Daniel,^s Ezra, Haggai, and Zechariah, to be all very unfavourable (and some of them directly

^s Daniel's elevation to be one of the chief ministers of the Median Darius did not weaken his devoted love for Jerusalem. For we read (vi. 10), that "when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his window being opened in his chamber towards Jerusalem, he kneeled upon

opposed to) the notion that the Darius of Daniel is to be identified with the Darius of Ezra.

We have neglected to notice the revolt of the Babylonians from Darius, who took the city after a siege of twenty months, cir. B.C. 516. He lowered the walls and dismantled the fortifications. It seems therefore inexplicable, that Darius should be described as *so* taking the kingdom of Chaldea in B.C. 493, twenty-three years after this murderous triumph over Babylon, that the year 493 should be called by Ezra, or any other writer, the first year of "Darius."

Nor does it seem to be credible that Darius Hystaspes, after having degraded (so to speak) Babylon in 516, should make that city his royal residence in 493. And thus, every inference from Daniel's narrative, that Darius the Mede made Babylon his metropolis, and the place of his royal residence, is a presumption, more or less strong, that he is not to be identified with the Darius of Ezra.

G. B.

THE REV. C. HOPE ROBERTSON ON THE ETERNITY OF FUTURE PUNISHMENTS.

THE best thanks of all who hold more hopeful views concerning the future of a large portion of the human race, than are contended for by the writer of the above article (Vol. I., p. 56, Fifth Series), are certainly his due, for presenting the arguments in support of the orthodox belief, in so concise a form that their examination is much facilitated. After a careful perusal of the article in question, we have been struck by, and have felt very thankful for, the appearance it presents as a whole; which, as an attempt to prove an important doctrine, seems to us, where not a complete failure, pre-eminently unsuccessful and unsatisfactory. Disagreeing entirely from the writer's conclusion, that sufficient is there collected "to establish the wavering, and strengthen the weak faith," in "the orthodox belief of our Church," we purpose examining, as briefly as possible, the arguments

his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God as he did aforetime." Is this to be regarded as fiction? And if we accept it as truth, who can believe that such a fearless worshipper of his God, and devoted lover of Jerusalem, could have been at the very summit of favour and confidence with Darius, for a year and half, and not have perseveringly and urgently pleaded with him in behalf of Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and the temple at Jerusalem, earnestly calling his attention to the decree of Cyrus?

by which he imagines he has proved the Eternal Punishment of unbelievers. Whether such is the belief of the Church of England, or not, cannot affect the question at issue, and we do not pretend to be able to give an opinion upon it; but the following quotation from a bishop who was the tutor of William Pitt, will shew Mr. Robertson that there is, at any rate, a difference of opinion on the point. "I shall endeavour to prove that the doctrine of Universal Redemption is asserted in Scripture, *and maintained in the public formularies of our Church*, and that there is no authority in either for the Calvinistic doctrines of Election and Reprobation."^a The language of the Thirty-first Article is strongly in favour of this opinion. "The Offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual."

Mr. Robertson draws proofs of his position from seven sources, which we will notice in the order in which he gives them.

I. The words of Holy Scripture. We of course admit that this, as every other question which relates to "the ways of God to man," must be decided "by what He has Himself declared He will do." We also agree with Mr. Robertson, that no conclusion should be arrived at, without "most certain warrant from God's own Word;" which "certain warrant," in support of the Eternity of Future Punishments, we hold is not contained in God's Word—the balance of evidence being decidedly on the other side. The bias of the translators of the English Bible has been most certainly on the side of Eternal Punishment;ⁱ and to this, and the "exclusive" tendency of all religious systems, are to be attributed, in a great measure, the strong hold which this doctrine has on the popular mind. But bad as our Bible is in this respect, it is not so bad as it is continually made to be, by writers who quote *carelessly*, and without consulting the book itself. We are told by Mr. Robertson (p. 57), that "This punishment is, in various passages, described as 'everlasting destruction,' 'everlasting shame,' 'eternal death,' 'everlasting burnings,' 'torment for ever and ever,' 'eternal damnation.'" Now, as to the

^a *A Refutation of Calvinism*, etc., etc., by Geo. Tomline, Lord Bishop of Lincoln and Dean of St. Paul's. Fourth edition. 1811. p. 185. The above quotation is from the fourth chapter, on "Universal Redemption, Election, and Reprobation," which he states was a charge to his clergy, and published at their request.

ⁱ See an article entitled "Plea for a Revised Translation of the Scriptures." *J. S. L.*, Fifth Series, Vol. I., p. 156.

first, St. Paul does not say the punishment of unbelievers is "everlasting destruction," but "everlasting (*αἰώνιος*, age-lasting) destruction *from the presence of the Lord*," (2 Thess. i. 9,) which is a very different thing, and can only mean the banishment of unbelievers from God's presence *so long as they remain such*. Neither "everlasting shame" nor "eternal death" occurs in the Bible from beginning to end, and where Mr. Robertson finds "this punishment" thus "described" we cannot even conjecture. "Everlasting burnings" occurs once (Isaiah xxxiii. 14), "Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings? He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly," etc., where it is surely sufficiently obvious that no reference to future punishment can have been intended. The phrase "torment for ever and ever" does not occur at all, but reference may be intended to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, or to Rev. xiv. 11. Concerning the former, it is impossible to take the parable literally; the difficulties are insurmountable, and it appears to refer solely to the rejection of the Jews (typified by the rich man), and the reception of the Gentiles (typified by Lazarus) into "Abraham's bosom," that is to say, the privileges of the Jews.¹ As to the latter, it is only necessary to say that if the passage and its context are to be taken literally (which is absurd), the reference cannot be to the future punishment of the wicked, after judgment, as plagues *on the earth* are mentioned as occurring subsequently. "Eternal damnation" occurs once (Mark iii. 29), but there the readings are divided between *κρίσεως* 'judgment,' and *ἁμαρτήματος* 'sin' (Vulgate *delicti*), and the only thing that is certain, is, that "damnation" is *not* meant. Nothing more remains to be noticed but the oft-quoted discourse (Matthew xxiv. and xxv.), the key to a comprehension of which appears to be the question of our Saviour's disciples (xxiv. 3), "Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world" (*συντελείας τοῦ αἵωνος*, end of the age, dispensation. See Hebrews ix. 26). To attempt an explanation here would occupy far too much space, but if Mr. Robertson will refute the arguments by which Dr. Lee has shewn the long past fulfilment of this prophecy,² we may be disposed to enter with him into the question, whether his literal interpretation is correct.

¹ Cf. *Three Questions Proposed and Answered*. By the Rev. David Thom. Second Edition. 1835. pp. 191—193.

² *An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy*. By Samuel Lee, D.D. Cambridge. 1849. pp. 133—136, and books ii. and iii.

How it may be said, "that every expression is used which could have been used, to convey the impression that this future punishment would never cease," we cannot discover, as an intelligent examination of the passages which are called proofs, certainly shews that the facts are against such an assumption. We do not wish to deny that there are many passages which appear to refer to some kind of punishment for unbelievers; but most of them are obviously figurative, and very difficult to understand. We follow a well understood rule, in explaining them by other passages, concerning which there can be no doubt whatever. We will quote a few such. If there is anything in God's Word which has more prominence than another, it is, that Christ came into the world "to make *an end* of sins, to make *reconciliation* for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness" (Dan. ix. 24). "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might *destroy* the works of the devil" (1 John iii. 8. See also Heb. ii. 14). Are sins made an end of? Will the works of the devil be destroyed, if one of Adam's race endures unheard-of torments through the act of the evil one? If this be true, Christ's mission was not to destroy the works of the devil, but to *perpetuate them*—to endow them with a never-ending vitality, a vitality which they would not have possessed but for that mission (as we are taught that through Him alone is the resurrection of the dead), and He must therefore have caused their sins to be imputed to millions, whose existence would otherwise have been, in mercy, ended with their physical death.

"All things shall be subdued unto him," says St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 28). How then can there be an opposition kingdom, planted by the devil, endless as God's own, where are held in iron fetters a large portion of the human race—a kingdom which He either cannot, or will not destroy? Such an idea is inconsistent with any rational comprehension of the divine attributes. "Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," said John the Baptist in prophetic ecstasy, when the Messiah was revealed to him, and the same grand truth is repeated again and again throughout Scripture. Types, symbols, prophecies, and their gospel fulfilment—all bear witness that Christ died an offering for ALL sin—that He tasted death for every man.

Which of these classes of texts should explain the other? We reply in the words of Tholuck,¹ "These two classes of texts seem to

¹ Quoted in *The Universalist*. Vol. i. 1850. p. 249.

me contradictory ; I cannot reconcile them. But when I reflect on the character of God, as a being of *love*, I lose all my doubts. Those passages are dark, but here all is light. Man has not utterly lost God's image ; there is something holy in him still—the flaming eye of God, the conscience ; and wherever there is this foothold, God will gain the heart at last." We would not, in the smallest degree, limit the blessings promised to believers ; they are God's Israel ; His adopted children, and His Church ; they are already in His kingdom ; but that they are the sole partakers of the sacrifice of Christ, it is impossible to prove from Scripture. The promises of God to believers are independent of, and in addition to, the pardon and imputed righteousness which our Saviour's obedience, more than co-equal with Adam's disobedience, secured for all men. Of what God's promises to believers, the forfeiture of which is the punishment of unbelievers, consist, we are assured it "hath not entered into man's heart to conceive," but remembering our Saviour's cross and passion, let us no longer picture to ourselves "a sole exclusive heaven ;" let us no longer despise and reject our brother, who has not made his peace with God in our way ; and let it not be the sad lot of any to say, in this day of Christian light and liberty—as St. Paul himself had to say—"We suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of *all* men, *especially of those that believe.*" "God's punishment for unbelief is evidently meant to be feared and avoided." What is its character, or whether it is exacted *in this world only*, there is not sufficient Scriptural evidence to *decide* authoritatively, but we trust we have shewn that God's Word has been falsely charged with teaching its eternity.

II. Mr. Robertson finds "strong support to the orthodox view of our Church" in the value of our Lord's atonement. A perusal of this portion of his argument has caused us very much surprise. We are pained to see, on the part of a minister of the Gospel, such an utter misconception of the mission of Christ. God gave up his Son that He might be just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them" (2 Cor. v. 19). Adam never had more than a contingent immortality, which he forfeited. Immortality is an attribute, not of the creature, but of the Creator *only* (1 Tim. vi. 16). "The first Adam was made a living soul (*ψύχην ζῶσαν*, Gen. ii. 7, LXX. See the same words applied to the *life of beasts*, Gen. i. 20, 21, 24, 30, and ii. 19, both in the *Hebrew and Greek*) ; the last

Adam was made a quickening (LIFE-GIVING) spirit."^m The whole human race was under a settled curse and banishment from heaven, (negative, not positive punishment), a curse which the "wondrous substitution of the Creator for the creature" removed for ever. It is therefore incorrect to say, that if all men are to be saved, Christ "saves us from only a passing and short punishment." What Christ saves all men from, is annihilation, non-existence; what He raises them to, is a future existence, eternal life (Romans v. and vi., and 1 Cor. xv). "God was working for eternity, and our eternity depends on that work." He degrades and undervalues Christ's atonement, who limits the number of those who partake of it; not he who says it availed for the whole human race, and will not admit, contrary to God's Word, that its non-acceptance nullifies and destroys it.

We charge the upholders of this doctrine of Eternal Punishment, and salvation *only* by faith, with the degrading and inhuman, yet logical and necessary, consequence of their theory; that millions, who never heard the name of Christ, are raised to endless punishment, *because*—and solely *because*—He who bore the world's sin "rose from the dead, and became the first-fruits of them that slept." *We* see in our Saviour's "life-long weight of grief," in "His curse-bearing agony," in "the priceless value paid for our redemption," not the danger of eternal punishment and ruin—by all this, barely and conditionally escaped,—but an absolute certainty, that these were not endured for a select few, but for every human being, all equally undeserving of the priceless favour.

III. Mr. Robertson thinks that Eternal Punishment is the "necessary condition of lost souls." It seems absurd to argue that anything is the "necessary condition" of those whose state (if there are such, which we deny) is utterly unknown; and we are inclined to leave this argument, the only foundation of which is assumption, to the refutation it carries with it, merely noticing one or two points.

^m For an explanation of the distinction between the Soul and Spirit, see an article on the "Tripartite Nature of Man" (Vol. I., p. 65, Fifth Series), also the latter part of an article, by the same writer, on "Eternal Punishment and Immortality" (*J. S. L.*, January, 1866). We desire to call the attention of the talented writer of these articles to the works of the late Dr. David Thom on the subject. His recently published posthumous work on the "Soul and Spirit" is doubtless in his hands, but should he not possess a previous work, "*Three Questions proposed and answered*," second edition, 1835), which shews that Dr. T. held similar opinions nearly forty years since, the writer will be very glad to lend it him, if he will communicate through the Editor.

We have yet to learn that the firmest believers ever, either lived, or died, except "in sin and inclined to sin," but we do not therefore conclude "they will always continue in a state of sin," because "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us (*i.e.*, believers) from *all* sin," and not ours only, but the sins of the *whole world* (1 John i. 7, and ii. 2), evidently not in the present state of existence, for either class, producing a sinless disposition; therefore, of necessity, producing that disposition—that holiness, without which "no man can see the Lord"—in a future state for both. Faith, however well-pleasing and acceptable to God, is not an act which, *in itself*, can make a sinner morally higher, or better fitted for the companionships of heaven. That is the work of renovation which Christ will accomplish, when He "shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." We therefore think that any argument, drawn from the moral unfitness of an unconverted man for future happiness, has no force whatever; as it applies equally to every human being, without that change which *Christ, not faith*, brings about in and for every man.

We cannot bring ourselves patiently to consider useless, aimless punishment, "punishment simply punitive, not remediative." It would be a disgrace for any human government to administer its laws so. How then can it be possible for the merciful God to do eternally, what the most cruel man would be ashamed to do for a few years? It is impossible. In the words of one of Christ's most faithful servants, "Eternal torments pay no debt; eternal torments cancel no offence; eternal torments have no satisfaction to divine justice; eternal torments are inconsistent with divine purity; because such a state, instead of extinguishing, accumulates offence. Eternal torments are an absolute denial of Christ's dying for our offences, and rising again for our justification."

IV. As to "the analogy of fallen angels," we confess Mr. Robertson has got quite out of our depth. Beyond one or two casual references to such beings, we are told nothing about them. These references are obviously figurative; as obviously misunderstood, and to a great extent incomprehensible. We do not know whether a Redeemer has been provided for them, or whether they require one; and it is by no means likely our curiosity will be satisfied on either point. The passage Mr. Robertson quotes (Hebrews ii. 16), in which he jumbles the textual and marginal readings together, evidently means that for His visit to this world, Christ did not take on him the nature of angels, but that of man. The interpretation

Mr. Robertson puts on this passage, is contrary to that of the English translators, and its obvious meaning; and his deduction is therefore fallacious. If his reading be correct, the reference is to all angels, bad and good. We have already given reasons for believing that Christ died for every man, and will therefore defer the argument that devils are more likely than men, to be permitted to leave the common place of punishment, until we have scriptural proof that either of them gets there.

V. The argument drawn from the "principles of government," human and divine, loses any force it might have possessed, when Christ's mission is looked upon as we have been trying to consider it in the preceding pages. If, in a future state, there is any possibility of a "rebellious element;" if any can be in a "chronic state of rebellion," or "plunge again into crime;" such vagaries are, judging from the analogy of the present condition, as likely to be indulged in by believers as by unbelievers. We think that, in a future state, the disposition to rebel, or to do anything contrary to the will of the supreme Sovereign, will be completely at an end; we think that every thought and every act will be in harmony with His; that as "we shall know, even as also we are known," we shall comprehend and acquiesce in His commandment, which is "holy, just, and good;" that this change from a finite to an infinite state of existence, from earth to heaven, will be the lot of all for whom Christ died—every man. When Christ reigns, after having drawn all men unto him, can there be any truth in the picture Mr. Robertson draws?

VI. The analogy of human government. Human punishments ought only to be inflicted for the sake of example to others, or reformation to the criminal; though they are too often prompted by a feeling of revenge, miscalled justice. The duration of the crime has nothing to do with the duration of the punishment. To follow the analogy in divine government:—for the sake of example to others, future punishment is obviously useless, when all who are not in course of being punished, are beyond the chance of sinning. Reformation cannot be the motive if the punishment is eternal. Surely none will suppose revenge is. Therefore there is no motive, and such punishment is impossible. As to the doctrine of sin being infinite, and needing an infinite punishment, that which is finite cannot do what can be magnified into infinity. The *finite origin* of the sin effectually prevents this. If every violation of God's law is an infinite sin, deserving an infinite punishment, every keeping of it, must

be an infinite virtue, deserving an infinite reward. Apart from this, whether the punishment of sin be finite or infinite, Christ has borne it.

VII. We certainly cannot see how "the failure of other modes of deterring from sin *in certain cases*," can be a reason why future punishments are endless. A supposed beneficial effect *in certain cases* proves nothing. If fear of endless torment has promoted the spiritual welfare of any, it is only another proof that God causes even man's misconceptions of His Word to promote His ends. We cannot but think that God has both foreseen and intended, that the Bible should be variously understood by those who look to it as their guide. The doctrine of future punishments does not by any means stand alone in this respect. If Mr. Robertson considers every doctrine drawn from Scripture, which has had a beneficial effect *in certain cases*, thereby proved to be correct, we are afraid he will have to import into his creed many doctrines which are utterly inconsistent with each other.

If unbelievers are to be eternally punished in a future state, where is their place of punishment spoken of? Certainly not in the Bible. Every one who has given the subject the slightest attention is well aware, that hell, in the sense in which that word is now understood, is not mentioned in Scripture.

If those miracles of our Saviour had alone been recorded by the Evangelists previous to performing which He asked the sick to believe (such as Matt. ix. 22 and Mark x. 52, see also Matt. xvii. 20, etc.), it would have been asserted that only believers were healed by Him. It is however impossible to imagine that only believers were healed, on such occasions as those related in Matt. xii. 15 and xiv. 14; the faith of the *centurion*, also, caused *his servant* to be healed; and therefore such a theory cannot be maintained. Similar forms of expression are used in relation to God's spiritual gifts. Are they inconsistent with each other? Again, Christ either died for every man, or He died for believers *only*. Those who think themselves at liberty to explain away passages which teach the former, must be prepared to consign to eternal torment every heathen, child, and lunatic, or their "essential belief" vanishes. If Christ *only* died for believers; evidently, *only* believers can be saved. If the line be once removed, where can we stop? Any argument which will prove the salvation of *one* unbeliever, will prove the salvation of all. For ourselves, we are content with the simple declaration of Scripture, that Christ died for all, and are certain that none for whom Christ died can perish.

In conclusion, we look upon the sacrifice of Christ as an act which is finished, and can neither be added to nor subtracted from. We believe that that sacrifice removed the sin of the world, not merely in the usually understood sense; that all may save themselves by believing; but that sin is made an end of, put away, utterly abolished in God's sight, from the completion of the sacrifice; and in its effect upon the race of man, from the close of this dispensation. We think that the *special* promises to believers are *aiōnios*, "age-lasting," in this world, in this life alone; that the punishment of unbelievers is, similarly, in this life alone. And truly, no Christian can think over what he has received, without feeling the truth of our Lord's declaration, that His people "shall receive an hundredfold *now in this time*" (Mark x. 29, 30). The peace of mind, the knowledge of his Saviour's love, which no worldly distress can remove, is, in itself, a glorious reward. Similarly, the ever-abiding curse of an unbeliever, is uncertainty as to his future; an uncertainty which nothing but true belief can remove. In the age to come, all have *aiōnios* life, a life co-existent with that age which is really *eternal*.

We think it the duty of a Christian preacher to proclaim the Gospel, the glad tidings, remission of sins by this Man; and to ask all to believe and accept that message; not that by this act they save themselves, but simply manifest their joyful and thankful acceptance, and willing participation, in what was done for them eighteen centuries ago. We do not think universal salvation should be proclaimed to the world; our thoughts on the subject might never have been committed to paper but for Mr. Robertson's article. Those who receive the message of redemption should read God's Word, and determine this, as every other point, for themselves.

Painfully conscious though we feel, of having omitted much which bears materially upon our view of the question; we trust we have said sufficient to induce some to search God's Word, without the "extinguisher" which orthodoxy too often places over it.

As surely as God is the omnipotent Ruler of the universe; so surely will He accomplish what He designs. Our Saviour shall yet see of the travail of His soul, and be satisfied; and satisfied we are *certain* He will not be, while His enemy reigns over *one* for whom He died. The Gospel of Christ's redemption is a glorious and a blessed truth; man's belief will not make it more true; man's unbelief cannot make it a lie, "for the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

E. C.

THE SEVENTY-WEEKS PROPHECY IN DANIEL.

AT page 476 of your last number, the Rev. Franke Parker offers some strictures on my interpretation of the Seventy-Weeks Prophecy in Daniel, inserted in your number for January; to which I beg leave to make some reply.

I. In my argument I have assumed the correctness of the received chronology, which places the commencement of the Peloponnesian war in B.C. 431. Mr. Parker would throw it back twenty years; and with it the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, who died, according to Thucydides, in the seventh year of the war. I have read with attention his *Light on Thucydides* and *The Athenian Year*; but with sincere respect for his learning, industry, and Christian zeal, I feel unable to adopt his chronological scheme, because it is open to stronger objections than that which he would supersede.

No doubt several dates of the Parian Marble, and the twenty archons mentioned in Demosthenes and elsewhere, but not found in Diodorus's list, present a difficulty to the followers of Diodorus: I therefore fortified myself with the authority of Corsini, whose strong opinion in favour of Diodorus Mr. Parker candidly cites; and then goes on to cite his equally-strong opinion in favour of "the author of the *Parian Chronicle*," which he evidently thinks neutralizes the other, for he presently adds: "With this testimony of Corsini to the *Parian Chronicle*, it seems strange that any one should rely on the *fasti* of Diodorus." He justly thinks Corsini a decisive authority; but if he reads on a little further he will perceive that his testimony is—not to the *Parian Chronicle* itself, which he pronounces erroneous in differing from Diodorus but—to "*the author*" of the *Parian Chronicle*, whom he believes to have been so well-informed and so accurate a person, that he can only attribute the errors of his chronicle to the blundering of the mason who engraved the Marble: "Tantum certè abest, ut erroris hujus labem in accuratissimo scriptore admittendam existimem, ut hac etiam in parte ipsius Fastos accuratos esse, omnemque dissidii vel erroris causam imperito quadratario tribuendam esse, contendam; qui non ubique certè, sed variis solum in locis, auctoris mentem aut calculum minus accuratè nobis expresserit." This is very important, because it proves that Corsini gave his verdict in favour of Diodorus, with all the *pros* and *cons* of the case before him. Mr. Clinton mentions some causes which contributed to make the lists of archons inaccurate, and upholds Corsini; but adds, that Wesseling, in his notes on

Diodorus, has illustrated the archons so copiously, as to supersede and surpass Corsini.*

Mr. Parker states that he fetches his arguments, not from the history of one kingdom only, but from those of "Persia, Macedon, Rome, and Athens;" but Clinton and the learned authors of *L'Art de Verifier des Dates* have done the same, making collateral histories check one another; and I must continue with them to believe that the Peloponnesian war began in B.C. 431.

II. Mr. Parker objects to my placing our Lord's crucifixion in the year A.D. 29; and to the sense in which I take "the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar's ἡγεμονία," Luke iii. 2, in order to suit this date.

1. He says, "The crucifixion must have been on a Friday, and on a full moon," when the sun was in Aries.^p According to Columella, the sun entered Aries the 17th of March." He rightly supposes that our Lord expired at the time when the Jews generally would be killing their Paschal lambs, for this is what Philo is speaking of; and he says that this was done τῷ μηνὶ τούτῳ (Nisan), περὶ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτην ἡμέραν, μέλλοντος τοῦ σεληνιακοῦ κύκλου γίνεσθαι πλησιφαοῦς, i. e., "when the moon's orb was *about* to become full of light." The Latin translator, missing the point of μέλλοντος, renders this, "toto lunæ orbe collustrato lumine;" which has misled Mr. Parker into saying, that the crucifixion must have been *on* a full moon, instead of *just before* a full moon: according to Philo and Josephus, Nisan 15 was always *on* the full moon between March 17 and April 17. Hence Mr. Parker's year, A.D. 33, is out of the question; because in that year the Paschal full moon, or Nisan 15, was on a Friday (as he proves from Ferguson's *Astronomy*); therefore Nisan 14, when the Paschal lambs would be killed, was a *Thursday*, but our Lord was crucified on a *Friday*.

The real problem to be solved is, to find a year within the necessary limits, in which the *full moon* between March 17 and April 17 fell on a *Saturday*, the Jewish Sabbath. In the ten years from A.D. 25 to A.D. 34, there is one year, and but one, which fulfils this condition, viz., A.D. 29. In that year, the true time of full moon at Jerusalem (by Hansen's Tables) was on the Jewish Saturday, March 19, at 9h. 26m. P.M., and that would be the canonical Nisan 15. The true time of new moon was Friday, March 4, at 2h. 26m. A.M. Mr. Airy assures me, that the young moon would be visible at the follow-

* *Fasti Hell.*, vol. ii., Introduction, p. x.

• *Philo de Mose III.*, tom. ii., p. 169.

^p Joseph., *Ant.*, iii., x., 5.

ing sunset : therefore Saturday, March 5, would be the canonical Nisan 1 ; and Friday, March 18, would be the canonical Nisan 14, on which day our Lord was crucified. I have ascertained these facts from the careful computations of Mr. Airy, the Astronomer Royal, and Mr. Hind, of the *Nautical Almanac* Office, and there can be no mistake.*

If our Lord then was crucified at the Passover, A.D. 29 (as appears from Mr. Parker's own references rightly understood), and if his public ministry lasted three years, he was baptized somewhat before the Passover A.D. 26 ; and his forerunner might begin about the Feast of Tabernacles, or September, A.D. 25.

2. St. Luke's "fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar's *ἡγεμονία*" has to be reconciled with the last date, A.D. 25 ; and Mr. Parker objects to my mode of doing this. He cites several instances from Philo and Josephus, where the word *ἡγεμονία* is used of the reign of an emperor in the ordinary sense ; and then says, "We presume no doubt can exist, that St. Luke by the fifteenth year of the *ἡγεμονία* of Tiberius must have meant the fifteenth of his reign after the death of Augustus." But doubts on this subject do exist, and have long existed, among learned men ; for the simple reason, that it has been found impossible to make out the Gospel chronology satisfactorily on that hypothesis. It is but reasonable therefore to enquire, whether St. Luke may not have computed this *hegemony* from an earlier epoch. It is notorious, that the reigns of kings and emperors are often computed from more epochs than one. To take an instance of this from Scripture. Nebuchadnezzar was associated with his father in the kingdom just before his expedition against Jerusalem, two years before his father's death. The Jews, who first became acquainted with him by that expedition, computed his reign from the earlier epoch ; the Babylonians themselves computed it from his father's death. Hence we have a double computation of the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign in Scripture itself ; for Daniel followed the Babylonish computation, but all other parts of Scripture that mention him follow the Jewish.†

In like manner, Tiberius Cæsar became first known as emperor to the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine by the law which made him *emperor in all the provinces* three years before the death of Augustus. That death made no difference in the *hegemony* conferred on Tiberius by that law, except that he held it alone ; he only continued to hold

* See my Papers in *J. S. L.*, Jan. and Oct., 1863, and Jan., April, and Oct., 1866.

† See Prideaux, *Ad annos* B.C. 606, 604, 562.

the *hegemony*, which he had already held in the provinces for three years. Coins bearing his "image and superscription" were struck at Antioch and Seleucia pointing to that early epoch, some of which are still extant. Luke, as a citizen of Antioch, would be well acquainted with that law and those coins. The other five notes of time which follow in the same sentence are taken from the province; it is perfectly natural, therefore, to conclude, that Luke means Tiberius's *provincial ἡγεμονία*, and dates its fifteenth year from his first accession to it in A.D. 11. Mr. Parker objects, "As the joint reign of Tiberius with Augustus was but three years, how could St. Luke have spoken of the fifteenth year of it?" But I have nowhere described the *ἡγεμονία* as "the joint reign of Tiberius with Augustus;" that is his own phrase, not mine.

I hope that Mr. Parker will deem this reply to his strictures satisfactory; and that he will allow that I have produced a straightforward exposition of the prophecy, and verified its fulfilment according to the received chronology. If so, I trust he will allow that this is strong presumptive proof that the received date of the Peloponnesian war is correct; and that the prophecy is thus seen to be what Sir Isaac Newton considered it, the pillar of Christianity.

*St. Stephen's, Coleman Street,
August 22, 1867.*

JOSIAH PRATT.

ON MR. GILLESPIE'S ARTICLE, "JOB."

THE Book of Job is either *pre* or *extra* Judaic. The social condition which it reveals is *patriarchal*. It knows nothing of a ceremonial law, or of the existence of great empires. The grandeur of its ideas, the freedom of its speculations, and the sublimity of its symbolism, tell of the liberty and independence of the desert. Its general tone and the character of its theosophy ally it to the religious systems of those early ages which preceded any formal revelation, and of which Brahminism, Zoroastrianism, and Druidism, were the later corruptions, in the Arian division of the Caucasian or Adamic race. If so, the Book of Job is unspeakably valuable as a portraiture of the thoughts and feelings of Semitic men, ere their phase of the primal faith underwent corruption at the hands of Egyptian priests and Assyrian Magi.

Did not Moses *find* it among Jethro and his people. Its tone and style are so different from that of the greater part, if not the

whole of the Pentateuch, that the author of the one could scarcely have been the author of the other. Moreover, Moses was bred from his very cradle among the ritualistic priests and polished courtiers of Egypt, a country especially under the influence of tradition and precedent. Now the author of the Book of Job was especially a *child of nature* (in the latitude of Syria and Arabia). It is not, perhaps, too much to say, that he *must* have been a *tented dweller in the wilderness*. Had it been written by one of the later prophets, it would have been dogmatic and denunciatory. But it knows nothing of the evils of a perverted faith, or the corruptions of an effete and complex civilization.

Of course I can be no judge of its Hebrew, but even should this be found to bear some indications of a later period, this would only suffice to prove that, in its *present* form, it is a transcription from some older record. Its essentially primal character is stamped on what is far deeper than mere verbal specialities, *i. e.*, on its *ideas*.

J. W. JACKSON.

IGNATIUS AND NICODEMUS.

I TRUST I may be pardoned calling your attention, and that of others, to two sentences which appear in the epistles of Ignatius, as found in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library (Apostolic Fathers), published by Messrs. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh.

In the Epistle to the Magnesians, p. 181 (shorter text), the following appears: "*And therefore He (i. e., Christ) whom they (i. e., the prophets) rightly waited for, being come, raised them from the dead.*"

In that to the Trallians, p. 200 (longer text), is found, "*He (i. e., Christ) descended, indeed, into Hades alone: but He arose accompanied by a multitude,*" etc.

If the former should be said to have reference to Matt. xxvii. 52, surely the latter cannot.

Can there be, in either the one or the other, allusion to the Apoc. Gospel of Nicodemus, chap. xix., ver. 12, "*And taking hold of Adam by his right hand, he (i. e., Christ) ascended from hell, and all the saints of God followed Him?*"

If so, how will this affect the authenticity of the epistles of Ignatius?

JAMES BRIERLY,

Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Mossley, near Congleton.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1866. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, M.A. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons.

THE Bampton Lectures for 1865, by Mr. Mozley, gave us great satisfaction, and Mr. Liddon's course for 1866, now before us, is an equally admirable book. A copy of each in the hands of every clergyman in the united kingdom would be an immense boon, for there are few who have not, at some time or other, to defend as well as to propagate the faith, and to shew the reasons for belief. Many have not alone to shew the reasons for belief, but to defend those reasons, to defend their defences, and so on *in perpetuum*. Beside all this, they have to carry war into the camp of the aliens, to scatter it by the sword of truth, and to destroy it by the fire of saint-like zeal. For this so great work leisure and means are, not seldom, all too scantily supplied. Nevertheless, the fact remains, we live in the age of apologetics, and every man must do his duty as best he may; and, for practical purposes, such volumes as those of Messrs. Mozley and Liddon are sure to be a great help.

The lectures of Mr. Liddon are many-sided, and nothing short of a perusal of them can suffice to enable any one to realize their variety and comprehensiveness. And yet their author says, "Eight lectures can deal with little beyond the outskirts of a vast, or, to speak more accurately, of an exhaustless subject." If he says this after printing seven hundred and seventy octavo pages, we may guess how limited a knowledge of the theme most of us possess. In his first lecture he observes that the question is a strictly theological one (Matt. xvi. 13), affirming that Christ is the Son of Man, and enquiring what He is beside. To this question of enduring interest three answers are possible, the Humanitarian, the Arian, and the Catholic. After remarking on the advantages of the Catholic answer, he states the ground he takes, and removes preliminary objections. The second lecture is on "Anticipations of Christ's divinity in the Old Testament" (Gal. iii. 8). The principal divisions are,—1. Foreshadowings, and 2. Predictions and announcements. Arguments are here skilfully combined with facts, and the whole is applied to the question at issue. The third lecture, on "Our Lord's work in the world a witness to His divinity" (Matt.

xiii. 54—56), comprises three chief divisions,—1. Our Lord's plan; 2. Success of our Lord's plan; 3. How to account for the success of our Lord's plan. This is a singularly interesting lecture, and readers will not fail to admire its copious diction, its happy arrangement, its flow of ideas, and its abundance of appeal to fact. The fourth lecture, "Our Lord's divinity as witnessed by His consciousness" (St. John x. 33), starts by shewing that the Christ of history is the Christ of dogma, and goes on to treat of the Gospel miracles and our Lord's self-assertion. Under this second head it is noted that the first stage of His teaching was chiefly ethical; and that the second stage was one of increasing self-assertion. The author then views this self-assertion in its bearing upon the human character of our Lord. The conclusion of the argument is, that either Jesus was consciously and culpably insincere, or that He spake truth, and must be taken at His word. The fifth lecture is on "The doctrine of Christ's divinity in the writings of St. John" (St. John i. 1—3). It opens with a condensed, but lucid and complete, summary of objections to the fourth Gospel, and the facts which refute them. The distinctive features of this Gospel are next pointed out; it is supplementary, polemical, and dogmatic. The remaining leading propositions of this masterly lecture are:—It is a life (that is, John's Gospel is a life) of the Eternal Word made flesh; It is in doctrinal and moral unison with John's Epistles and the Apocalypse; Its Christology is in *essential* unison with that of the Synoptists; It incurs the objection that a God-Man is philosophically incredible; and St. John's writings oppose an insurmountable barrier to the theory of a deification by enthusiasm. The sixth lecture is "Our Lord's divinity as taught by St. James, St. Peter, and St. Paul" (Gal. ii. 9). This is a very full examination of the evidence supplied by the apostles just named, and an intimation that St. Jude's Epistle implies that Christ is God. Having thus gone over the entire ground of Scriptural testimony, the author proceeds in his seventh lecture to treat of "The Homousion" (Tit. i. 9). This is not simply a dry doctrinal discussion and analysis, but has a literary and historical character, which makes it both interesting and instructive. It supplies very powerful proof that the author's doctrine was always the orthodox faith of the Church. "Consequences of the doctrine of our Lord's divinity" is the subject of the last lecture (Rom. viii. 32). What these consequences are is stated with much force and precision. A few useful notes and a good index conclude the volume, the course of which we have too briefly and inadequately sketched.

Mr. Liddon is one who reads, remembers what he reads, and reasons upon what he reads; he has a happy facility in expressing himself; and a spirit of deep-toned and powerful religious sentiment pervades all he writes. Such men are an ornament and a treasure to any church, and contrast most favourably with half-earnest and noisy pretenders who think by superficial learning and undigested arguments to overthrow the ancient faith. We are thankful that the honour and glory of the Lord Jesus can never be assailed by any proud boasting Goliath with impunity, for some David is sure to gird on his armour for the defence. It is to some extent unfortunate that if a German, a Frenchman, or some stranger attacks Christianity, there is in many minds such a presumption in his favour, that they either dread him or are inclined to believe him. It is also indubitably true that in this country Unitarianism has some powerful supporters, and that the New Testament has some able opponents. But, notwithstanding these facts, there is a broad and deep conviction in the popular mind which will not soon be uprooted, and which God in his providence preserves by such agencies as those of Mr. Mozley and Mr. Liddon, and a host besides. Of course Mr. Liddon's book is not popular in its form, but it will be read by those who will assimilate its facts and ideas, and its beneficial influence will be felt by many who never hear of it. Considering the enormous importance of St. John's Gospel at this time, it is a question whether, if practicable, the fifth lecture, which treats of St. John's writings, should not, wholly or in part, be published separately for wider circulation. There was some sagacity in the remark of somebody, that if he could dispose of St. John's Gospel, he should not be long in bringing down all the rest, and perhaps Christianity itself.

Christian Schools and Scholars; or, Sketches of Education from the Christian Era to the Council of Trent. By the Author of "The Three Chancellors," "Knights of St. John," etc. In Two Volumes. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

THE design of this work is excellent, and its author has read much, and amassed a large collection of curious facts, although it cannot be denied that he is wanting in critical acumen. This is the weakness of the book, and our heart has been pained by the presence of apocryphal and fabulous matter, indiscriminately intermixed with genuine history, and set out as such. The very first chapter, on "The rise of Christian schools," is marred by the incorporation of legends which have no historical foundation whatever. The author even believes that the faded

copy of St. Mark's Gospel, "written with his own hand, is still preserved at Venice;" and that St. Mark not only took this to Alexandria (which cannot be shewn), but the Apostles' Creed, and at least an earlier form of the Liturgy which bears his name. Such things may be on record, but they are history none the more for that. The same failing characterizes the chapter on "The Schools of Britain and Ireland," and it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate the truth from the fiction. Yet we have no doubt that in all the principal churches of the ancient world, the clergy were the friends and promoters of education and learning. The author's profession as a member of the Roman Church may explain, but it cannot excuse, his ready credence of unfounded statements.

Another feature of the work which we cannot commend is the *couleur de rose*, which is imparted to so many of the persons and circumstances brought before us. One would imagine that in former times the Church was as fertile in saints as now she is in common prelates, and that all the vast multitude of saints were of as gigantic a stature in spirit as St. Christopher was in the body. It may have been so, but we doubt it, and we rather suppose that hosts of those now designated saints seemed to their contemporaries very much what modern priests seem to us, *mutatis mutandis*. If Christianity is the same, why should not Christians be the same? Why should not Providence be the same? Why do we see no such wonderful men as swarm in the legends of the dark ages? This is not all: our author, down to the very termination of his work, insists upon giving us exaggerated and highly coloured pictures.

Another feature of the work which we cannot commend, is the natural consequence of the other, and merely another form of partiality. Referring to the "black-death" in the reign of Edward III., the author says, "nine-tenths of the English clergy are said to have been swept away by the terrible plague, together with the population of entire cities," etc. But he goes on in his very next sentence, "The effects of the pestilence were less fatally disastrous than those caused by the heresy of Wickliffe," and this is only a little of what we find in the same strain; but this little, ill-tempered as it is, is a confession of the wonderful results of Wickliffe's work. It is all very well to ascribe the results to "low buffoonery," "coarse invectives," "pernicious doctrines," "malicious adversaries," "heresies and nonsense," and such like, but the writer who uses such language is not a candid historian. The Reformers naturally have not much praise. Thus

Bucer is "that horrible apostate, a renegade Dominican, who condescended to every one of the rival schools of heresy, provided only he was suffered to enjoy the licence which first tempted him to abjure the faith." "The notorious Henry Bullinger" is another. These are things which it is our duty to point out and to regret, for it is impossible that the work which contains them should be read with confidence even when it is truthful and just. There is no need for the historian to become the partizan, and whether he be Protestant or anything else, his obligations is to write without calumny and misrepresentation. During the period of conflict in the sixteenth century, Reformers were generally described as men of unbridled licentiousness and boundless maliciousness, and we have seen many ribald attacks upon them so grossly indecent, and so disgustingly profane, that it is no wonder if the present generation feels their influence. The virus which took such loathsome forms in the sixteenth century is now content with insinuation, inuendo, vague accusation, or simple assumption of conviction of crime. But no matter how it shews itself, it is mean, base, and a sign of hopeless weakness. Look at that of Bucer, of whom they report that Cardinal Contarini said he was, single-handed, more than a match for all the Roman bishops : an excellent reason for calling him bad names, as it was thought a good reason for turning his bones out of the sepulchre, under that good queen Mary, and revengefully burning them. Why should our author never be able to meet a Reformer, or any one who judged for himself without bespattering him ? His credulity is no more evident in his swallowing whole the wretched fables and legends of antiquity, than in his acceptance of calumnies against men of whom he really knows little beyond their names, and not always so much, if we may judge by his spelling.

Referring to the French renaissance school, our author says it is "mostly remarkable for its poets, by whom indeed the revival of letters was first set on foot. Much edification was not to be anticipated from a movement that reckoned as its originator Villon, whose verses were as infamous as his life, and who found a worthy successor in Clement Marot" (vol. ii., 355). Such are the terms in which our author speaks of two men to whom posterity has rendered ample justice, but whose vindication he seems to know nothing about. Why did he not make up his triad by lugging in Beza, whose juvenile verses were as loose as morals at Rome under his Holiness Alexander VI., and for some time before and after. Did Villon's infamy consist in his be-

believing in a God in heaven? for he never denied Him. Great his faults and follies were, perhaps, but almost the only real knowledge we have of him is in his poems, and there he often imitated the licentious language of his sacerdotal betters. As for Marot, much the same may be said, perhaps much worse, for he was accused before the Inquisition of being favourable to the Reformation, and of having eaten lard in Lent. He must have been infamous, for he escaped out of his holy persecutors' clutches, and proceeded to the further enormity of rendering part of the Psalms into French verse. He must have been infamous, for he was one of the Reformers, every one of whom bears the brand of infamy. But this is not history.

We do not for a moment suggest that these volumes do not contain much valuable matter. Errors and peculiarities disfigure them as merely literary productions, but these we will not insist upon after the graver errors which we have mentioned. If we look for what is good we find it, and wise readers will know how to distinguish the chaff from the wheat. We gladly recognize in the ages preceding the Reformation many bright spots. Those middle ages were not wholly dark and corrupt. Undoubtedly there were iniquities and enormities of the most flagrant description, but the desire of learning was never quite extinguished, and the love of goodness was never utterly dead. None but an enemy to Christianity, if not to humanity, can deny that noble men and great institutions are to be found in every chapter of the Church's history. These are chronicled by our author, and although he is apt to exaggerate under certain circumstances, we cheerfully recognize the truthful element of his work. It must have cost him much labour, and he has displayed real ability in many portions. While, then, we deprecate the occurrence of such things as we have pointed out above, we do not pronounce by any means an unqualified censure. There is very much here that cannot be found in any other single work we know, and it has its decided excellencies. From the nature of the case it is to a considerable extent a literary history, although it cannot pretend to cover the whole of the field. To some extent it is a commentary upon the facts recorded, but it reveals no great originality of conception, or acuteness of criticism.

There is a remark which we wish to make about the index at the end of the work, and it is that it makes no allusion to a number of important names of persons. The omissions are too significant to be accidental,—comprising as they do Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, Latimer, Lewis, Castalio, Foxe, Ascham, and others who occupy a cer-

tain position in the book. If the omissions are not intentional, the circumstance is none the less to be regretted. We do not expect to meet with every name in the index, but we should have none so carelessly left out, that their non-insertion awakens suspicions of unworthy motives. Luther, to name no more, is referred to quite often enough to make the omission of his name by the index inexcusable. We had hoped we were living in an age which needed not to return to the tactics of other and less liberal times; and with this sentiment, we conclude a task, which, in some of its details, we have performed with sincere reluctance.

Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache, von FRIEDRICH BÖTTCHER. Herausgegeben von FERD. MÜHLAU. Leipzig: J. A. Barth.

THE author of this elaborate work died before its publication, and hence its appearance under the editorship of Dr. Mühlau. The first volume only is out, and that consists of about six hundred and fifty large octavo pages closely printed. The second and concluding volume may be expected ere long. A mere summary of the contents of the first volume would require considerable space, and much more would be needed for a critical analysis and estimate. The compilation must have been a long and laborious undertaking, for, so far as we have been able so examine it, it is in every sense an original work. Profound research, critical acumen, and copious illustration characterize it, and we are disposed to think it one of the most important contributions ever made to the study of the Hebrew language. The introduction contains a short general account of the Shemitic languages, and of Hebrew in particular; a history of the Hebrew language and literature; a history of the Hebrew philology and other matters. The discussion of the powers and uses of the letters of the alphabet and other signs is exhaustive, and, in fact, a monument of patient research.

Proceeding from separate signs and their phenomena to words, the author takes a similar far-reaching survey of the subject. Beginning with the parts of speech, he goes on to the formation and inflexion of words, the composition of which is analyzed with minute and exact analysis. He then treats of inflexions of pronouns, and of nouns in a like masterly manner. His application of the principles of comparative philology is one of his peculiar characteristics, and it enables him to throw much light on some of the obscurest problems of the Hebrew language and its cognate dialects, with all of which he has a scientific

acquaintance. The work will be a perfect storehouse of the results of Hebrew philological investigations, and as such will be of immense service to the students of that and the kindred languages. We regret that we have not had time to go thoroughly into the subject, but we are anxious to call attention to a publication so distinguished by many remarkable features. Hebrew students know by painful experience how often they are foiled in their attempts to learn from accessible grammars, the explanation of facts connected with the structure of the language. They will, therefore, gladly avail themselves of a grammar to which they may resort with the assurance that they will find what they want, and in many cases more than they expected to discover.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library. Edited by Rev. A. ROBERTS, D.D., and JAMES DONALDSON, LL.D. Vol. III. Tatian, Theophilus, and the Clementine Recognitions. Vol. IV. Clement of Alexandria. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THIS is really a great national work, and its value and importance will become increasingly apparent. There is no collective English edition of the Ante-Nicene fathers; several of them have never been translated into our language at all, some only partially, some very inaccurately, and some very well. We wanted something on a level with the learning and accomplishments of the age, and the projectors of this noble series are endeavouring to supply the desideratum. The editors are men of standing, and we may be sure they will do their part as well as they can. True they cannot do everything, and they therefore avail themselves of the services of translators, who are judged competent. Still the difficulties are great, and when all has been done that could be done there will be some things left imperfect. We think it would have been well to prefix to each author a complete list of all the works assigned to him, whether extant or not. The translation of fragments as well as entire works is adopted very properly. The occasional notes and Scripture references might have been made a little more numerous; and in cases like that of the Recognitions, where very diverse recensions of the text exist, the circumstance should be clearly explained. There is a Syriac text of the Recognition, shorter than the Latin, and otherwise important, and it has been published, but it is not mentioned in the edition before us. Curiously enough, this Syriac ends in chap. i. of book iv. of the common text, very near indeed to the place where one at least of the German critics, previously to its discovery, decided that it ought to end. As some may wish to

note the precise place where the ancient Syriac text concludes, we add that the last sentence corresponds with that on p. 282 of the English version, thus rendered: "We acted in the same way at Tyre, and Sidon, and Berytus, and announced to those who desired to hear further discourses that we were to spend the winter at Tripolis."

Knowing the extreme difficulty of translating much that is read in these old documents, where style and clearness seem to have been lost sight of, we congratulate the gentlemen occupied upon the work on their success as a whole. In Clement of Alexandria, other obstacles have fallen in the way, but the editors have prudently resolved that Latin should take the place of English in a few cases where our sense of delicacy might be offended. Hitherto there has been no English version of Clement, but his works are so rich a mine for the Christian student that we sincerely rejoice to see the present instalment of a complete version.

We trust the enterprize will be crowned with the abundant success it deserves.

The Complete Works of Thomas Brooks. Edited, with Memoir, by the Rev. A. B. GROSART. Vols. V. and VI. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

Nobody should overlook some of the works included in Mr. Nichol's series. The volumes by Brooks, for example, are worthy to be examined carefully and pondered by us all. For if, as will certainly happen, we shall be unable to coincide with the author in all, or nearly all he says, we shall learn a good deal, and be set thinking. Strange and quaint many of the expressions are, alternately grim and glorious the imagery is, the profound and the common place come side by side, fact and fancy jostle each other, but piety is redolent in every page, and the author has all the glow and earnestness of a saint. His puritan theology is imbedded in all that is practical and experimental, and is not merely dry and scholastic. A good deal of curious lore might be extracted from the work by the inquisitive. Thus it says they (the Mahometans?) say that "in the midst of hell is a tree full of fruit, every apple being like the head of a devil, which groweth green in the midst of all those flames, called *zoaccum agacci*, or the tree of bitterness; and the souls that shall eat thereof, thinking to refresh themselves, shall so find them, and by them and their pains in hell they shall grow mad, and the devils shall bind them with chains of fire, and shall drag them up and down in hell; with much more which I am

not free to transcribe." In his appeals to the heart and conscience he is usually very powerful. His treatment of his subjects is often diffuse, but he turns every topic round and round and views it on all sides, so that scarcely an idea which it is capable of suggesting remains unnoticed. His reading must have been exceedingly multifarious, as he quotes or refers to a very large number of authors of all ages and countries. This may be seen at a glance by consulting the copious index of authorities at the end of the sixth and last volume. The careful editor has not only supplied this index, but others, of texts, rare words, and subjects. The editor has also supplied many short notes and references. Mr. Grosart says, "The word useful is the one word which accurately expresses the position of Brooks among his contemporaries," and we may accept his judgment. Whatever the author wrote he manifestly sought to do good by it, and Calamy is quoted as saying, "He was a very affecting preacher, and useful to many; and though he used many homely phrases, and sometimes too familiar resemblances which to nice critics appear ridiculous, yet he did more good to souls than many of the exactest composers; and let the wits of the age pass what censures they please, he that winneth souls is wise." We can tolerate his quaint conceits, and award him high praise if we cannot say with his editor that his works are "inestimable."

The Path of Repentance: being Village Sermons for Lent and Easter.

By HUGH TAYLOR, M.A. . London: William Macintosh.

THE twelve sermons contained in this small volume, are what they profess to be, "Village Sermons," and as such are simple, Scriptural, and practical.

Short Arguments about the Millennium; or, Plain Proofs for Plain Christians, that the coming of Christ will not be pre-millennial; that His Reign on earth will not be personal. With an Essay on the bearing of Prophecy on the present time, and the relation of the Papacy to Prophecy. A Book for the Times. By B. C. YOUNG. Second thousand. London: E. Stock.

WE favourably noticed the first edition of this book, and we regard the present edition as an improvement on the first. It is curious that so many write in favour of millennial theories, and so few against them; but Mr. Young renders it evident that there are difficulties in their path which ought to teach them modesty, and not to assume so much

as they generally do. With some of the views of our author we do not agree, but we do agree with him in the essential argument and theory of his book, which ought to be extensively read now that ingenious but mistaken speculators are deluging us with their millennial fancies. Superficial readers of Scripture, and uninformed persons generally, are in great danger of being led to adopt unscriptural explanations of prophecy, and their friends will do well to place Mr. Young's book in their hands.

A Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament, with a New Translation, by M. M. KALISCH, Phil. Doc., M.A. Leviticus, Part I. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

THE volumes already published by Dr. Kalisch, it is needless to say, have given him a position among the critics of the Bible which none dispute. His opinions on many subjects remind us that he is a Jew and not a Christian, and that he claims all reasonable freedom in his researches. But it is some proof of his candour that he follows the leading of no party, and often differs notably from some of the chiefs of the school with which he is nearest allied.

The introduction to Leviticus takes up the following matters:—The connection between Exodus and Leviticus; Division of Leviticus; Its illogical arrangement; Its component parts; Chronological order of laws in first ten chapters: Name of the Book; Its importance. Under the third of these heads he notices the “bounds and gaps, repetitions and interpolations, almost too numerous to point out;” and regards it as an inevitable result of inquiry “that the Book of Leviticus cannot possibly be the work of one author and of one age; but that it is composed of various portions written, enlarged, and modified by different authors in harmony with the necessities and altered conditions of their respective times.” Elsewhere he calls Leviticus “a compilation of various smaller collections or treatises.” Speaking of the importance of the book in the economy of the New Testament, he says, “The notions of vicarious suffering and sacrificial death as a means of expiation and grace, in which the late dispensation is centred, cannot be thoroughly understood without an exact knowledge of the spirit of the Levitical laws; hence the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews exerted himself, by every effort of sagacity and dialectic ingenuity, to point out the analogy between the sacrificial doctrines of the Old and the New Covenant; for he felt how much was gained by making the precepts of Leviticus the foundation of the new creed of atonement!”

The preliminary essay "on the sacrifices of the Hebrews and of other nations," fills no fewer than 469 pages, and any attempt to summarize it here would scarcely comprise its divisions and subdivisions. Here are some of the former: Origin of Sacrifices; Relative Age of Animal and Vegetable Sacrifices; History of Sacrifices among the Hebrews; Purer notions of Sacrifices; Hebrew appellation of Sacrifice, and its meaning; General survey and classification of Hebrew Sacrifices; Animals and Vegetables offered; Qualification of offerings; Symbolical meaning of objects connected with Sacrifices; Sacrificial ceremonies and their meaning. The importance of the two last named sections will be at once apparent, for nothing is more essential to the form of the Mosaic ceremonial than its symbolical and typical character. We differ very much from Dr. Kalisch's explanations of the reasons for various details, although we often agree with him up to a certain point; and we always respect his learned, skilful, and dispassionate treatment. But to proceed with our enumeration: the author goes on to consider the Bloodless offering, Drink offering, Burnt offering, Thank offering, Sin and Trespass offerings, Offering of Jealousy and Paschal sacrifice. This last leads him to introduce the Doctrine of Vicarious Sacrifice, which he admits; and the Christian Sacrifice, which he rejects. He then compares the Hebrew sacrifices with those of other nations, and examines the question of human sacrifices in general. He next treats of Hebrew idolatries, and human sacrifices among the Hebrews; but he rejects the idea that the law required or allowed the latter, and ably refutes the texts alleged for it. His last section is upon creation, miracles, prayer and other devotions, revelation, inspiration, and prophecy. He regards miracles as impossible and incredible; revelation is explained away; inspiration is reduced to nothing extraordinary, so that men may write books better than the Bible; and prophecy is repudiated in its proper sense.

The translation and commentary contain much that will serve to elucidate the ten chapters included, and will be valued by all students, though all may not agree with the whole of it. A long and curious essay on the Hebrew priesthood is introduced after chapter vii. The volume also contains the Hebrew text of the ten chapters translated.

From the foregoing rapid survey it will appear how multifarious are the matters treated of, and treated of in a way which demonstrates the immense resources of the author. Everywhere we find evidences of his wonderful familiarity with the Hebrew text, and with all the principal writers upon it, and subjects arising out of it. With ancients

and moderns, with Jews and Gentiles, he is equally at home, so that his reading must be enormous, as well as his powers of assimilation, and of reasoning on what he takes in hand. Erroneous as we think much of his theology is, we cannot overlook the many noble sentiments which he utters, and with one of these, and a remark upon it, we conclude. "Truth, virtue, and active love—these three form the creed of the future, but the greatest of these is truth; for enlightenment leads to self-control and self-denying deeds; knowledge alone is able to keep man on the path of moderation and thoughtfulness, and thus to secure, through virtue, his inward peace and happiness." Our remark is, that truth, virtue, and active love, find their most powerful motives, and their highest illustration in religion; and that if they are pursued apart from God disgraceful and miserable failure will be the result.

The Philosophy of Evangelicism. Second Edit. London: Elliott Stock. THIS is a very calmly written, thoughtful book, and one the perusal of which cannot fail to be suggestive. The author is a reasoner, and with much of his reasoning we coincide, although we do not approve of his application of every text he quotes. For instance, he speaks of "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" which misses the true sense of the passage. When St. John speaks of those "whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," he means what can be best shewn by an inversion of the clauses, and a correction of the translation: "Whose names have not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that has been slain." The writing, and not the slaying, is from the foundation of the world. Such, at least, is our conviction, although we admit that good names may be pleaded for the other sense. That the atonement was "foreordained before the foundation of the world" is a fact stated by the best authority (1 Peter i. 20). The author looks deeply into human nature and the Gospel, and shews the applicability of the latter to the wants of the former. If he establishes, as we think he does, that the evangelical scheme is every way philosophical, he cuts away the ground from mere ceremonialism on the one hand, and from rational scepticism on the other.

Heroism; or, God our Father, Omnipotent, Omniscient, Omnipresent.
By HORACE FIELD, B.A. London: Longmans, Green, Reader,
and Dyer.

THIS book has character, whereas the majority of books have none.

It is written in a free and independent style, and its author both thinks and ventures to record his thoughts. The prologue and epilogue are poetical, and, like the rest, are spirited, if not brilliant. Mr. Field is altogether a religious man, and he is not afraid to reason about religion. The subject of his short, but very emphatic chapters, are, Evil, Good, Freewill, Prayer, The Word of God, and Law. He is one of those who see God in everything, and everything in God; and we think most men would be wiser, better, and happier, if they did so too. We have been much pleased with the book; its ability, originality, and heartiness are quite refreshing. The least we can hope is that many will read it.

Symbols of Christendom: an elementary and introductory Text-book.

By J. RADFORD THOMSON, M.A. London: Longman, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

SYMBOLS appear to be necessary. As man is imitative, he will see resemblances, and will fix upon certain things as representative of other things. Many books have been written upon the subject, and some of them are as worthless as books well can be; others, however, are of great merit. A proper understanding of Scripture symbols is of immense importance, but very little sought after. In like manner, it is quite desirable that intelligent Christians should be able to interpret the symbols which are so numerous in ecclesiastical art, as they were in some Pagan countries. Mr. Thomson refers to these different branches of knowledge, but he gives most prominence to Christian symbols, of which the catacombs supply many examples reaching over a succession of centuries. The series of topics illustrated brings us down to our own time and country, so that we obtain a glimpse of the symbolism of our High Church worship. It is a good and seasonable volume, well and carefully compiled by one who has read and thought much on the subject, and who, although his proclivities are not favourable to an elaborate ritualistic symbolism, expresses himself with frankness, and, as we think, most judiciously and wisely. The book supplies a desideratum.

The Man of Sorrows, and His Relationships. A contribution to Religious Thought. London: E. Stock.

LIKE *Ecce Homo*, *Ecce Deus*, and some others, this book indicates a tendency of mind in this age of ours, and one which, wisely directed,

may lead to most blessed results. We have come back to Christ, and have begun at least to contemplate Him. Possibly we may come to love and trust Him. The little book before us is a contemplation of Christ, and of what has been thought or may be thought of Him. The work may be read profitably by anybody, but it will be a great help to any enquiring young man. There are a few things in the book which may not seem to be quite sound and orthodox, but a moment's reflection must shew that the author's difficulty is with technicalities of language, and not with fact. Men have used certain words till they have become a shibboleth with no decided meaning; but the time is past for judging one's orthodoxy by his vocabulary, and the time is come for speaking one's thought in one's own language.

David, the King of Israel. A Portrait drawn from Bible History and the Book of Psalms. By F. W. KRUMMACHER, D.D. Translated by Rev. M. G. EASTON, M.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THE name of Dr. Krummacher will to multitudes be a sufficient passport for this volume. David has been grossly and grievously misrepresented by many, and there is therefore a reason for this work. But there are other reasons, and especially that the life and character of David is fitted to be a most profitable study. As in the case of *Elijah the Tishbite*, our author elaborately dwells upon the incidents of the prophet's life, the features of his character, and his utterances. He treats his subject with remarkable fulness, and felicity of language, and illustration. His deep-toned piety and evangelical insight enables him to detect spiritual analogies and adaptations at every step, and the result is, a book well-fitted for Christian edification. The admirers of Dr. Krummacher's other works will cordially thank him for this.

The Root of Ritualism, and other contributions to the Periodicals of the Society of Friends; with added Papers, chiefly relating to the views and practices of that Society. By WILLIAM BALL. London: F. Bowyer Kitto.

MR. BALL finds the root of Ritualism in the perpetuation and exaltation of the Baptism and Supper of the early Christians. He writes clearly, intelligently, and reverently, and many of the observations scattered over his pages will be read with interest by others than members of the Society of Friends.

Essays on Religion and Literature. By various Writers. Edited by Archbishop MANNING. Second Series. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1867.

The Church and the World; Essays on Questions of the Day in 1867. By various Writers. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1867.

THESE series of essays, though on some points contradictory and destructive of each other, are only too nearly alike in their relation to the spirit and tendency of the age. Their very existence is a phenomenon of much significance. That readers can be found for such books, or that authors dare to publish them, is a token of the vast change that has passed upon the English people. A change not wholly to be deplored,—for free discussion on *any* subject is absolutely necessary to intellectual and spiritual life; and a religion of mere routine, incapable of explaining and justifying itself, is both immoral and demoralizing. Nevertheless, it is noway cheering to find the intellect committing suicide, and logic proving the inadequacy of all argument, and liberty surrendering herself to despotism. An appeal to private judgment for the purpose of securing the destruction of private judgment; an earnest entreaty that men would think for themselves *once*, in order that they may arrive at the conclusion that *ever afterwards* the priest should think for them; this semblance of freedom and candour is by no means edifying.

“The Church and the World, 1867,” is not equal in interest or literary ability to the first series of essays with the same title. It contains little that is new; and the essays are neither sufficiently popular for the many, nor sufficiently scholarly for the few. The first, “On some Results of the Tractarian Movement of 1833,” by Mr. Bennett, of Frome, is a mere anticipation of what is far more fully affirmed and copiously illustrated in the Report of the Ritual Commission. It can no longer be doubted that the Anglican Establishment has begun to repudiate its Protestantism, and to teach once more those very dogmas which the people of this country believed that their reformed Church existed to deny. The real meaning of this re-action, however, and even its extent, is far more truly estimated by Archbishop Manning. Still it is dangerous, and we may be thankful that it is no longer disguised. When we know what the Tractarian party really want, we shall soon be able to make up our own minds. “The Sacrament of Marriage,” “Sisterhood Life,” “Private Confession and

Absolution," "The Three Vows,"—that is the kind of thing to bring these matters to an issue. The essays "On Preachers and Preaching," "On Religious Toleration," "On the Curate Question," and "On the Court of Final Appeal in Causes Ecclesiastical," are an ingenious *reductio ad absurdum* of the Establishment principle; a series of clear proofs that it never has worked and never can. Granting certain fundamental and preposterous assumptions, allowing for that radical and incurable and also unconscious unfairness which the pretence of infallibility always produces, it may be cheerfully allowed that these essays are very admirable specimens of what Christian controversial writing should be. They are transparently sincere, meant to convince, courteous to opponents, and in a special—though somewhat narrow—region for the most part accurately learned. No doubt there must be a fight; it is utterly certain that pretensions which involve the worst forms of priestcraft must be met and put down. But there is scarcely even pain in a conflict where the opponents are honourable gentlemen fighting with fair weapons.

There is this fatal absurdity in all Roman Catholic theology,—that the conclusions are already pre-determined, and we may not even question the premises. Argument ceases to be interesting when it is wholly superfluous. It is difficult to see why the "Essays on Religion and Literature" should have been written; for while their conclusions are already known, it is not dangerous only, but surely heretical, to found those conclusions on the verdict of private judgment. Nevertheless, here the essays are, and if infallibility chooses to run the risk of public controversy, infallibility ought to know best. The really interesting paper, however, in this series is Dr. Manning's "Inaugural Address." Therein he dwells upon the great change that has passed over England, and the re-action in favour of Catholic dogma and life,—regarding it almost as "more wonderful and visibly supernatural" than any which can be found in history. He clearly perceives, however, that *the* tendency of England, as yet, is towards Rationalism; and that even the Tridentine theology itself, accepted on the ground of its reasonableness, and as an act of private judgment, would be but a mere form of heresy. "To believe the whole Council of Trent, with interpretations and glosses of private judgment, would not bring a soul into the Catholic Unity." Above all, he has the profoundest trust in the Bishop of Rome as the living voice of God. It is hard to trace the course of the divine government through all the entanglements of a revolutionary age like ours; but "we shall best learn the plans of the Master-Builder

from the declaration of His Vicar upon earth." To such a depth of debasement can even a man like Manning sink! The plan of the future of Europe and the world—the *divine* plan—sketched for us in "the Encyclical." It is impossible to beat that. K.

Liber Librorum: its Structure, Limitations, and Purpose. A Friendly Communication to a Reluctant Sceptic. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1867.

A VERY well-meant and rather washy book. When you may choose your own sceptic, and especially your own *reluctant* sceptic, conversion is mere child's play. But why should scepticism be reluctant? Scepticism only means a habit of enquiry, stimulated by wholesome doubt; a complete refusal to take the rules of life for granted without examination. In everything but religion such a habit is considered most praiseworthy. Moreover, if scepticism meant (which it does not) positive disbelief, disbelief might be a very important duty, and reluctance would be not a virtue but a vice. In fact, belief and disbelief should be wholly independent of the will; and moralists teach us that to struggle against our convictions is a baseness.

The author of this book is far more liberal than the ordinary "orthodox;" indeed, cuts away with the utmost energy the very foundations upon which he is resting. What willing sceptic could desire a more comprehensive concession than this? "The declaration, 'the Lord said,' 'the Lord spake,' or phrases of similar import, occur probably a hundred times in the Pentateuch alone; and in by far the greater part of these cases the words are used, *not* as asserting in each separate case a direct and immediate divine revelation, but as implying *the settled convictions of the speaker* as to the divine will (p. 26). So again, as to the slaughter of the Midianites,—"*That the great lawgiver was justified in so doing we have no right to assume*" (p. 28). What is this but saying that the whole Jewish dispensation was simply the result of "the settled conviction" of Moses? Possibly a very reasonable explanation, but not one likely to diminish scepticism. Indeed, our author admits so much, that it is difficult to see what he contends for. The moral worth of the Bible is not denied by sceptics. The *infallibility* of the Bible, and for the most part (so much that the residue is insignificant) its *supernatural* origin our author himself abandons. He is, therefore, in that interesting state of development in which he may do service perhaps to reluctant sceptics; but in which *not* reluctant sceptics, if he does not mind, will do—a good deal to *him*.—K.

The Voice of the Prayer Book. Lectures and Annotations on the Liturgy: Expository and Apologetic. By REV. N. LORAINÉ. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

THE Prayer Book has a voice no doubt, but it is a source of endless vexation that men will interpret that voice in such different ways. To some extent the ambiguity of the book must be blamed, but very much is due to the personal feelings of interpreters. Those who plead the ambiguity as a reason for revision, are usually told that the same argument applies to the Bible, of which it is rather quaintly said:—

“One day at least in every week,
The sects of every mind
Their doctrines hither come to seek,
And what they seek they find.”

The cases are not parallel; for while a revised version would clear up some obscurities of the Bible, the Prayer Book must be subjected to some such process as a parish church undergoing “restoration,”—something must be added, and something taken away. The times must be our excuse for these remarks. As for Mr. Lorainé's book, we find in it very much of which we cordially approve. It supplies useful information and suggestions for the laity, and its tone is every way commendable. The author's churchism is moderate, his reasoning generally clear, his language dispassionate, and his aim practical. Most of the features of the Prayer Book are reviewed, and the offices are explained and historically illustrated.

Sermons preached in Liverpool. By ANDREW WILSON, B.A. London: Rivingtons.

THERE are eighteen good sermons in this volume fitted for the wants of an ordinary congregation. They are rather plain and unpretending, as sermons ought to be; and another recommendation is, that they are Scriptural and practical. The language is clear and well chosen, and everywhere indicates a preacher intent upon the spiritual improvement of his flock. Quite free from ostentation and display, these discourses are an excellent example of what pulpit ministrations ought to be.

Vie de Jésus, par ERNEST RENAN. 13ème Edition, revue et Augmentée. Paris: Levy.

THE thirteenth edition of M. Renan's *Life of Jesus* differs in so many details from its precursors that we must not omit to mention it, although

it reached us too late for minute examination. It contains a new preface giving some account of the modifications introduced, and various observations arising out of the subject, and the experience of the book. In reference to the authorship of St. John's Gospel, the author has changed his opinion since he published his first edition. Then he regarded the fourth gospel as substantially the work of John, but altered by his disciples. Now he says: "The fourth gospel is not the work of the apostle John. It was attributed to him by one of his disciples about the year 100. The discourses are almost entirely fictitious; but the narrative portions embody valuable traditions, going back in part to the apostle John. This is the opinion of Weizsäcker and Michel Nicholas. It is that to which I now adhere." Of the opinion of those who say the fourth gospel is in no sense, St. John's, he says: "I still believe that the fourth gospel has a real connection with the apostle John, and that it was written about the end of the first century." This change of opinion has led to the alteration of all the passages in the work based upon his earlier view. We cannot be certain, of course, that all the altered notions now advanced are final; they may be supplanted by others, or be set aside for the old ones. But account must be taken of them in any subsequent dealings with the work. It cannot but strike us, however, that the facility with which the members of the critical school abandon the conclusions upon which they have so strongly insisted, should make us pause before we accept their statements. It shews us, too, that after all the advances which have been alleged, the transition state is not yet passed; and that under the circumstances, the steady adhesion to a well-defined hypothesis gives the orthodox a decided advantage.

Besides the preface and the alterations in the text, the new edition is supplied with a long appendix "upon the use that should be made of the fourth gospel, in writing the *Life of Jesus*. This appendix reaches from page 477—541. Its closing sentence is, "This time I have had but one aim, to shew that in recurring so often, in the *Life of Jesus*, to the fourth gospel, to establish the thread of my recital, I have had strong reasons, even though the said gospel should not be from the hand of the apostle John." These words alone indicate two things: first, that in M. Renan's opinion there is a force in the arguments for the genuineness of St. John's Gospel, which he is too acute not to perceive and too candid to deny; secondly, that the fourth gospel is of essential importance to the maintenance of the Church doctrine respecting the person and work of Jesus. Perhaps we may add, that M. Renan

does not proceed so far or so fast in his negations as some others do, and would have him to do. He is in a manner compelled to defend himself for wandering so far from orthodoxy, and for keeping so near to it! We shall be sorry if his fine genius is persuaded to surrender to the clamour of the reckless; and we cling to the hope that his many departures from what we believe, may be followed by a return to safer and more substantial ground than he now so often occupies.

Ecclesia Dei. The Peace and Functions of the Church in the Divine Order of the Universe, and its Relations with the World. London: Strahan.

Church Life: its Grounds and Obligations. By the author of *Ecclesia Dei.* London: Strahan.

THESE two works are intimately associated, and the second is the complement, and partly a key and illustration to the first. Some would, perhaps, suggest that the *Church Life* should be perused before the *Ecclesia Dei*. Whether or not, the first should not be read without the second, nor the second without the first. They are the product of the same mind, and that a mind of no common calibre, well exercised and disciplined, and deeply influenced by religious sentiments and principles. The theological and ecclesiastical difficulties of our time are such, that now, if ever, men of mark are wanted to help us. The timidity and superficiality of recent years has to be thanked for very much of our actual trouble, and if we are to be delivered the Church must awake and put on strength. Our author states that by means of larger and deeper views of Christian truth than are commonly entertained, he has sought to unfold "an explanation of the chief difficulties of our position at this time, and to furnish some practical suggestions for really effective modes of action with respect to them." With him God's Church is not merely a reality, an integral part of the Divine order of the universe, but a symbolical manifestation of that order: ideas which raise the Church to its proper level, and tend to exalt our conceptions of its functions. We do not suppose for a moment that the Church practically corresponds with its lofty ideal, but we do think that in its ideal we find at once the standard of its duty, and the clue to its privilege and glory. The object of our author is to bring his reasonings to a practical issue, and we willingly recognize the practical element which pervades both the books before us. He is mistaken, however, if he thinks many of the clergy will follow him through the

mazes of his argument ; most of them neither have time nor taste for such close reading. Those who do follow, will, we suppose, agree with us, that portions of the books, however admirable as intellectual exercises, are quite speculative ; perhaps, they will say further, that some things lie open to strong objections. On the whole we wish the author had tried to adopt a simpler diction, and made his philosophy easier by his language ; for it would have materially facilitated the usefulness of what he has written. To a certain extent the smaller book will clear up those portions of the first to which we chiefly refer ; but we confess that the power of ordinary readers, or at any rate their willingness to enter into a train of close reasoning, has been over estimated. The force of logic, the depth of thought, and the earnestness of soul which characterize the two productions, render them in every way remarkable, and worthy of study.

Ritualism, in some of its recent developments incompatible with the worship of God in Spirit and in Truth. By the Rev. G. S. DREW, M.A. London : Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

WE gladly recommend this useful and instructive pamphlet. The author treats his subject wisely and well, and with most of his views we quite concur.

Essays and Discourses on Popular and Standard Themes. By Rev. T. W. TOZER. London : E. Stock.

THIS volume contains six essays, and as many discourses. The first essay on popular excuses for the neglect of religion and its ordinances is appropriate and sensible. The remaining subjects appear to be all chosen for their practical bearing. We have no doubt the author's congregation will largely patronize the book, but it is one of general interest,—earnest, hearty, and thorough. The style of the book is good, clear, and forcible. In its teachings and tone we see nothing to object to, and much to approve and commend. Mr. Tozer is a congregational minister at Dudley, and we have occasionally traced the influence of the sphere in which he labours ; but this increases the fitness of his work for those among whom he lives.

Reason and Religion : or, the leading Doctrines of Christianity. By Rev. R. E. HOOPPELL, M.A. London : W. Macintosh.

THIS may be called a compendious system of theology. The author endeavours, in a series of sermons, to develop the doctrine of Scripture,

and to shew that the doctrine is in accordance with right reason. The work contains many excellent passages, and it will be useful to those who would understand the nature and grounds of those things which our religion teaches and enjoins. The standpoint is mainly evangelical; in other words, nothing is advanced which does not appear to rest upon a Scriptural foundation, and nothing is rejected which does appear to rest on the same foundation.

New Books, some of them received too late for review:—

An Exposition, with Notes, on John xvii. By George Newton. Edinburgh: Nichol.

One Hundred Reasons against Auricular Confession and Priestly Absolution in the Church of England (answered). London: Masters and Co.

Occasional Papers on Scriptural Subjects. By B. W. Newton. London: Houlston and Wright.

The Sacraments and Sacramental Ordinances of the Church. By John H. Blunt, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

Remarkable Facts: Illustrative and Confirmatory of Holy Scripture. By Rev. J. Leifchild, D.D. With Preface by his Son. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

De Vita et Scriptis S. Jacobi Batnarum Sarugi in Mesopotamia episcopi. J. B. Abbeloos. Lovanii.

Vom Menschensohn und vom Logos. Dr. L. T. Schulze. Gotha.

Ernest Renan,—Vie de Jèsus, treizième Edition. Revue et Augmentée. 8vo. Paris: 1867.

Apologetische Vorträge über die Heilswahrheiten des Christenthums, im Winter 1867 zu Leipzig gehalten. Von C. E. Luthart. 8vo. Leipzig: 1867.

Saint Paul. Sa Vie, son Œuvres et ses Epitres. Par Felix Bungener. 8vo. Paris: 1867.

Grundriss der Patrologie oder der ältern christlichen Literärgeschichte, von Dr. J. Alzog. Freiburg im Breisgau.

Mose Prophetie und Himmelfahrt. Eine Quelle für das Neue Testament, zum ersten Male deutsch herausgegeben, im Zusammenhang der Apokrypha und der Christologie überhaupt, von Dr. Gustav Volkmar. Leipzig.

Geschichte der neuzeitlichen Christlich-Kirchlichen Apologetik. Von Dr. Karl Werner. Schaffhausen.

De Sacra Scriptura ejusque Interpretatione Commentarius. Scriptore Josepho Danko. 2 Voll. Vindobonæ.

Thesaurus, sive Liber Magnus, vulgo "Liber Adami" appellatur; opus Mandæorum summi ponderis descripsit et edidit H. Petermann (Lithograph). Two Vols., 4to. Leipzig. 1867.

Merx (Ad.), Grammatica Syriaca. Particula Prima. Halle. 8vo. 1867.

Remy (W.), Der Sündefall. Vier auslegende Betrachtungen zum 2 u. 3 Kapitel des 1. Buches Mosis. Herausgegeben von C. Nitzsch. 12mo. Berlin. 1867.

- Allgemeine Kirchliche Chronik**, begründet Von K. Matthes, fortgesetzt Von Mor. Herm. Schultze. 12mo. Altona. 1867.
- Strack (Karl)**, Bilder aus der Reformationsgeschichte. 4^r Band. Geschichte der Evangelischer Secten. 8vo. Leipzig. 1867.
- Chronologie des Manetho** von G. F. Unger. 8vo. Berlin. 1867.
- Materialien zur Kritik und Geschichte des Pentateuchs**, herausgegeben von Paul de Lagarde I. 8vo. Leipzig. 1867.
- Geschichte des Volkes Israel und der Entstehung des Christenthums**, von Dr. G. Weber und Dr. H. Holtzman. Two Vols., 8vo. Leipzig. 1867.
- Praktische Theologie**, von Dr. C. E. Kritzsch. Dritter Band. Zweite Abtheilung (die evangelische Kirchenordnung). 8vo. Bonn. 1867.
- Elementa Linguae Chaldaicae, quibus accedit Series Patriarcharum Chaldaeorum**, a J. Guriel exarata. 8vo: Rome. 1860.
- Humanität und Christenthum**, von H. Kritzler. Zweiter Band. Cultur und Kirche. 8vo. Gotha. 1867.
- Theologische Ethik**, von Dr. R. Rothe. Erster Band. Zweite Auflage. 8vo. Wittenberg. 1867.
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum**. Vol. II. M. Minucii Felicis Octavius, etc. 8vo. Vienna. 1867.
- Das Markusevangelium nach Seinem quellenwerthe für die Evangelische Geschichte**, von A. Klostermann. 8vo. Gottingen. 1867.
- The Church of England in Harmony with Holy Scripture**. By Josiah Bateman, M.A. London: W. Macintosh.
- An Enquiry into the Primeval State of Europe**. London: Marlborough and Co.
- A Refutation of Certain Charges made by the Brethren**. London: Houlston and Wright.
- The Scripture Ground of Justification**. By Rev. E. H. Hoare, M.A. London: W. Macintosh.
- The Real Presence Denied and Defended**. By H. Heinfetter. London: R. Elliott.
- The River of Life**. By James Biden. Gosport: J. P. Legg.
- A Glimpse at Protestant Education and Literature in Bohemia**. By A. H. Wratislaw, M.A. London: Bell and Daldy.
- The Literal and Spiritual Senses of Scripture**. By Rev. A. Clissold, M.A. London: Longmans.
- Jesus Christ: His Person and His Plan**. By J. Clifford, M.A. London: E. Marlborough.
- Tracts for the Day**. Edited by Rev. O. Shipley, M.A. No. 4. Miracles and Prayer. No. 5. The Real Presence. London: Longmans.
- North British Review**. September.
- American Bibliotheca Sacra**. July.
- Colonial Church Chronicle**.
- Church Builder**.



MISCELLANIES.

The Four Gospels.—It is important that we should decide what kinds of evidence may be reasonably looked for, and the forms in which we may justly expect it if it exists. And in order to do this it may be well to observe that we have only in our hands a small portion of the Christian literature of the second century. The very names of some writers have perished. Of others we have only the names; of others we have merely the titles of their books; and of others only fragments more or less extensive. The numerous sects which arose have all perished, and our knowledge of them is by no means perfect. We do know that some grafted pagan philosophy, astronomy, astrology, or Judaism upon Christianity, and that the product was often strange, unscientific, and absurd. The adversaries of the Gospel, again, have fared no better than its defenders and expounders, and as we have none of their books complete, we can only gather up imperfect details of what they said and wrote. The immense ruin of literature connected with Christianity is an unquestioned fact, and it is proved by the relics and references which extend from the beginning of the second century to the council of Nicea, in A.D. 325. But these relics and references, like the fallen palaces and temples and the broken inscriptions of antiquity, are beyond all price, and teach us more than they express. This destruction of evidence ascertained, we must see that we have only a small portion of what originally existed, and it reminds us that we must not argue as if we had the whole. The loss is not all due to the neglect or the hostility of Christians, for we know that the heathen persecutors of the Church often seized and destroyed its books. Other causes contributed to the same result, and it would seem that in this respect Christian writings stood on a level with those of other men. What would be given now for the lost books of Livy, of Tacitus, and of a whole host of Greek and Latin authors? But they are gone, perhaps for ever, and our best hope is only that fragments of them may turn up, as happens ever and anon with Christian documents.

The quantity of evidence at our command is then much less than originally existed, but fortunately its quality is as far as possible from being worthless. What are the forms in which it exists? There are first of all a great number of quotations from the four Gospels more or less full and exact. These quotations are often not perfectly accurate, and

are often very brief, but that they are quotations will scarcely be denied. There are quotations in which the sources are indicated, whether with or without the names of the evangelists. There are quotations which are not said to be such, although we know they are such, and find them in our Gospels. These are frequently woven into the texture of sentences exactly as occurs with preachers and writers of our own day, who employ texts and phrases from the Gospels without at all intimating that they do so. Sometimes we have not even quotations, but only allusions more or less explicit. These allusions may be to one or more of the Gospels as a whole, or to isolated facts and teachings contained in them. Under the head of allusions we have some which are even more important and decisive than some quotations, because they are equivalent to historical statements respecting the authorship, credibility, or canonicity of the Gospels.

In addition to quotations and allusions, we have two other forms of evidence for the existence of the Gospels in the second century, and these must not be lost sight of. I refer in the first place to the oldest translations of the Gospels, and hereafter I shall illustrate this point by an appeal to facts which go far to prove that at a very early period the Gospels not only existed, but were acknowledged and circulated in all parts of the civilized world. The other form of evidence which we have is indicated by the word *influence*. The extension and character of Christianity is inexplicable apart from the Gospels, without which it would have been a very different thing from what it really was—could not in fact have been the same. A second department in which the influence of the Gospels is seen, is that of literary composition. Who will tell me that, without the Gospels, Ignatius and Polycarp, Justin Martyr, and other writers of the second century, could have written their books? From end to end these writings are leavened by the Gospels. This is seen in their ideas, their sentiments, and their very words. I do not say the influence of the Gospels alone, because there was that of the Pauline epistles, and other books of the New Testament; but I do say that the Gospels were the chief power at work.

Without prejudging the question of the precise value of any one of the forms of evidence to which I have alluded, I believe that when all are combined they furnish a proof which will not easily be overthrown. But over and above all these there is the utter absence of any trace of an allegation that the Gospels were not written in the first century. Even Faustus, the Manichæan, who late in the fourth century some-

times denies that the Gospels were genuine, at other times only says they were interpolated. Somewhat earlier, Julian, the emperor, wrote against Christianity, but he ascribed the Gospels to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and we are quite sure that if any rumour had existed of their being later forgeries, he would have been told it, and would have turned it to account. I am not aware that before the time of Faustus any writer denied the Apostolic origin of the Gospels. They are opposed and rejected, their miracles are explained away, and they are even said to have been altered, but nowhere are they called a later forgery. The Church always had antagonists, both Jews and Gentiles, and any introduction and circulation of a spurious book would have been detected and branded with infamy. And, besides, professing Christians were not wholly made up of fools and rogues. There were many shrewd and intelligent men among them, men whose love of truth and deep sincerity triumphed over the fear of dungeons, fines, racks, exile, and even death itself. Yet these men accepted the Gospels as a divine rule of faith and life, as a true record of Christ, and as altogether genuine books. If it be true that a man cannot believe without evidence, they must have had evidence, for they believed. The unanimous consent of all, orthodox as well as heretical, in admitting the Gospels to be genuine, can only be accounted for by the fact that they were genuine. When the Council of Nicea was held in A.D. 325, more than three hundred bishops, Arian and Trinitarian, came together. They came from all the countries between Persia in the east, and Gaul in the west, and there were men from the shores of Africa, and the wild haunts of the Goths. They came from almost every centre of civilization, and from every seat of learning. All these received the Gospels. There were among them men of rare erudition and long experience, so that their consent is not merely that of A.D. 325, but it reaches back far into the earlier history of the Church. Eusebius of Cæsarea, the church historian, not an orthodox man certainly, was one of them, and I may venture to say that he was profoundly versed in the annals of Christianity and the ages preceding it. His Church History, his Chronicle, his Evangelical Preparation and Demonstration, his Book on the Divine Manifestation and other writings, prove what I affirm. Yet he accepted the four Gospels. His opportunities for enquiry were for that age unique, because he had access to the rare collection of the Christian martyr Pamphilus, whose wealth and energies were devoted to the formation of a Christian library at Cæsarea. The church literature of two centuries was under

his eye, but he never suggests that he lighted on a single sentence alleging the Gospels to be forgeries. If he was not perfect as a critic, and sometimes, though seldom, quoted obscure and spurious books as genuine, he was independent in his judgments, and consistently so in his really historical writings. The honesty of his quotations has in some cases been singularly vindicated in modern times. The huge mass of quotations which we find in his works is of unspeakable value to the literary historian.

It may not be uninteresting or unprofitable to mention a few other distinguished names by way of preliminary to the appeals upon which I shall enter in my next article. There was Lactantius, the learned and philosophical rhetorician, who flourished about the year 300. Of his acquaintance with Pagan and Christian literature he gives us abundant proof in his extant writings, wherein also he uses the four Gospels. Arnobius, the teacher of Lactantius, and a converted rhetorician, wrote a book against the heathen, in which he introduces various facts and statements drawn from the Gospels. Hesychius, one of the Diocletian martyrs, and an Egyptian bishop, published an edition of the New Testament. Methodius of Tyre, an eminent writer of the latter half of the third century, expressly mentions the four Gospels. The same remark is applicable to Victorinus Petavionensis, a German bishop of that period. About the middle of the century—A.D. 250—the famous Novatus flourished, and he cites the Gospels, mentioning some of the Evangelists by name. Contemporary with him was Cyprian of Carthage, whose quotations from the whole of the New Testament are plentiful enough. If we go back thirty years further we come upon a number of names of men whose testimony is of immense value. Let me mention some of them. Ammonius, the Alexandrian philosopher, published a Harmony of the four Gospels, and divided the Gospels into chapters, still called after him the Ammonian sections. Julius Africanus, the industrious chronologer, ransacked the archives of the past to compile a chronicle of the world's history. He also wrote upon the alleged discrepancy between Matthew and Luke in the matter of the genealogies; and Adam Clark thought his was probably the truest method of reconciling them. The remains of this very important writer, and of many more, are to be found in Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*. Origen was a host in himself, for he embodied nearly all the erudition of his time. He was born in A.D. 185, and at eighteen years of age was appointed tutor of the famous Christian academy of Alexandria. His industry was enormous.

Not only did he teach and preach, but he wrote commentaries on the Old and New Testaments, he critically edited the Scriptures from a comparison of older copies, he wrote an elaborate refutation of the heathen Celsus, and a multitude of other books. Now he accepted the four Gospels, and we may be quite sure that a man so given to research and so unfettered by conventionalism had the best reasons for accepting them. I may join with him his friend Ambrose, a wealthy senator, who spared neither money nor exertions to assist Origen in his studies. The one work against Celsus rigidly defines the state of the controversy about the Gospels, the genuineness of which even Celsus allowed. I am utterly unable to imagine how any one of the four Gospels could have been a forgery later than the Apostles, and yet admitted as authentic by Origen and other learned men of his day. Hippolytus, an older contemporary of Origen's, will have to receive more particular notice, as also will Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Hegesippus, the first historian of the church, and some more. Those, however, which have been mentioned are too solid and weighty not to have been raised upon a real historical foundation. The third century was but the extension and development of the second, for the church had still to stand on its own merits, and to hold its own against politicians and philosophers, Jews and Pagans; it had both to fight for its existence against the rulers and wisdom of this world, and to fight for the acquisition of new territories. Its weapons were not carnal, but its success was immense, and when it was seen riding calmly upon the waters, after the last terrific storm of a ten years' persecution, it was acknowledged victor, and Cæsar himself yielded homage to it. God and truth had been on its side; and, like every cause similarly protected, it ultimately triumphed.

The Vatican Testament.—The existence and great value of this book were known at the very beginning of the Reformation, but, for reasons which have never been stated, the Papal Government did not permit any edition of the New Testament portion to be published until 1857. What that edition was may be gathered from a review written soon after: "The work is well and handsomely got up. The type is very good, and the paper very stout, and capable of being written on. The text of the MS. is comprised in five stout quarto volumes, of which four contain the Old Testament, the fifth the New. The Old Testament—the Septuagint translation—is, of course, valuable, having never before been correctly published; but the New Testament is,

beyond all comparison, that which renders this work so especially important. On this account it is much to be regretted that the one cannot be separated from the other. The Old and New Testaments must be bought together. As the cost of the whole work is rather considerable—nine pounds—this is a serious matter to scholars, a race not usually burdened with wealth.” The Old Testament portion of the Vatican MS. was published as early as 1586, but, we repeat, the New Testament was kept back till 1857, and could even then be purchased for not less than nine pounds, for the cause stated by the reviewer. Protestants should connect this fact with another, which is, that *until 1857 not a single Greek New Testament was ever published at Rome*. That city, which claimed to be the depository of Holy Writ, and to be the centre, head, and soul of the Church, never sent forth a copy of the Greek Testament till three hundred and forty years after Luther began his labours. And when the book appeared, it was at a price which forbad all but the wealthy to purchase it. It is needless to repeat that, as the New Testament was originally written in the Greek, the publication of a copy from a MS. fifteen centuries old was exceedingly desirable in the interests of Christendom.

It might be supposed, however, that if the Papal Government would not allow their venerable New Testament to be published, they would suffer scholars and students to use it. This also would be almost wholly a mistake. Mr. Scrivener observes: “Tischendorf says truly enough that something like a history might be written of the futile attempts to collate Codex B, and a very unprofitable history it would be.” The opinion prevailed at one time that Pope Leo X. lent this Vatican MS. (or Codex B) to the editors of the Complutensian Bible, but it is more likely that the Pope did not let it go to Spain. In 1533 a Spanish theologian and historian, Sepulveda, who had spent much time at Rome, wrote Erasmus a letter containing a short account of the Vatican MS. He says: “There is in the Vatican library a most ancient Greek book, wherein are contained both Testaments, very carefully and accurately written in capital letters, and very different from the common copies.” Sepulveda supplied Erasmus with a number of various readings in support of his assertions, and for a long time these readings were all the practical acquaintance the world had with the MS. The eminent critic, Wetstein, reminds us that Erasmus heard of this document as early as 1521, because in that year Paulus Bombasius consulted it at his request. Curiously enough, the passage which led to this was 1 John v. 7, 8,

where the Vatican MS. contains less than our copies, and runs to this effect: "Because there are three who bear witness, the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one." When Mai's edition appeared in 1857, it was found that the common modern reading of this passage had been left in the text, while the reading of the MS. was put into a foot-note! This was hardly fair, because, whether the disputed words are genuine or not, they are not in the Vatican MS.

After the time of Erasmus, the Reformers much wished either to procure a copy of this extraordinary book, or a correct account of its readings. Theodore Bibliander wrote to say that he had promised for a copy as much money as might be required; but he never got what he wanted. Some years later, a Dutch student made certain notes which were turned to account by Lucas Brugensis, a Flemish critic and a Roman Catholic. So far as publicity was concerned, there was a pause at this point for nearly a hundred years, although it would be a mistake to say that the MS. was forgotten, for twice at least in the course of the seventeenth century it was more or less perfectly collated. Again, in the eighteenth century, collations were made at the cost of our eminent countryman Bentley; and these bring us almost to the end of another hundred years, for Birch's collations were not all published till 1798, nor Bentley's even in part till 1799.

For eighty years past, especially, there has prevailed at Rome what Mr. Scrivener calls "the system of jealous exclusion of strangers from their choicest books." Yet, during that time, there has been a greater anxiety to examine ancient MSS. than ever before. There was, indeed, one golden opportunity, but it was not properly improved. In 1809 the celebrated manuscript, with other precious treasures from the Vatican, was taken to Paris. It was then examined and minutely described by Dr. Hug, a German critic, and yet it was allowed to remain and to return to Rome uncopied and uncollated. Henceforth it was so much a sealed book that when Tischendorf, in 1843, wished to consult it, "after long and anxious expectation, during a visit to Rome that lasted some months," he only obtained a sight of it for two days of three hours each. In 1844 another gentleman got the use of it for nine hours; but in 1845, when Dr. Tregelles went, they only allowed him to see the MS., without writing anything. "They would not let me open it," he says, "without searching my pocket, and depriving me of pen, ink, and paper. . . . If I looked at a passage too long, the two *prelati* would snatch the book out of my hand." Yet Dr. Tregelles had letters of recommendation from Cardinal Wiseman!

Even since the publication of the Roman edition, we have met with many stories of the sort already told. Here is a specimen, where the details are rather suggested than stated, by the Rev. J. W. Burgon :—
“Though I saw it several times, I never but once had the opportunity of carefully and critically inspecting it. How it happened that this one opportunity was but of an hour and a half’s duration, and fell on the very last morning of my stay at Rome—so that I had literally to decide whether I would leave Rome without packing up my things or without making a hasty collation of Codex B—I forbear to explain. It were an uncongenial task : an ungracious as well as a most ungraceful proceeding. Rather would I record that I owed the privilege entirely to the prompt kindness of one of the most enlightened scholars and accomplished gentlemen in Rome—the Cavaliere G. B. De Rossi.” The hour and a half permitted to Mr. Burgon was eagerly improved, and the notes he then made were read with interest by many. He remarks that it is well known the MS. omits Luke xxii. 43, 44 ; John v. 3, 4, vii. 53 to viii. 11, and the last twelve verses of St. Mark’s Gospel ; but he adds it is not so generally known, with reference to this last omission, that more than a whole column is left blank after Mark xvi. 8, “thereby intimating, in the most eloquent manner possible, that there has been something consciously left out, for that blank column at the end of St. Mark’s Gospel is the only blank column in the whole Codex.”

It may be noted that Cardinal Mai, who edited this MS., died before its publication, and it was really given to the world by Father Vercellone. When Canon Wordsworth was in Rome, in 1862, he saw this gentleman, who, he says, in one of his dissertations had remarked upon the singular fact that before the appearance of Mai’s work the Church of Rome had never given to the world an edition of the Greek Testament in the city of Rome itself. The learned Italian regrets the fact, because, “if Rome had published a New Testament in Greek, that edition must have been the standard edition.” Dr. Wordsworth properly asks : “If the Church of Rome can give to the world standard editions of the Bible, how is it that she has never yet published an edition of the original Hebrew of the Old Testament ?” Our answer would be that, as the religion of Rome rests not on original but on second-hand authorities, it is not likely to publish the Scriptures in their original tongues. The Romanists boast of their Church as the great keeper and publisher of the Scriptures, but Rome never published the original of the New Testament till 1857, and has never published

the original of the Old Testament at all! The exceeding importance of this fact must be our excuse for so often referring to it.

Mr. Burgon's letters were published before Canon Wordsworth's visit to the Vatican, and it may be due to them, and reiterated revelations of a like character, that a more liberal practice prevailed, and that the Canon was readily allowed to examine the manuscript. Some time before this, Dean Alford was permitted to use it. He says, "I had access to it for five days in 1861, and examined some hundred or two of doubtful places; but five days' work in Rome is equal to not more than two days' in England, the nominal library hours at the Vatican being only three, and the real ones not more than two and a quarter."

By this time the reader will begin to get weary of a string of little scraps about people who went to see the manuscript, and who did not half succeed: how about the successful men, and the book itself? As for the successful men, there have been the librarians of the Vatican for four centuries, but they did not care to enlighten the world on the subject. Somewhere about 1828, however, the late Cardinal Mai was authorized by the Pope, Leo XII., to bring out an edition. Mai did not hurry himself; and when he did work, it was quite negligently. But eventually his edition was printed, and Tischendorf saw a volume of it in 1843. But, although printed, it was like the "notable prisoners," Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, of whom Bishop Latimer told the people, as we read in the history of our English Reformation. What was the cause? Partly the extreme and childish reluctance of the Papacy to publish a New Testament which differed so frequently from the Latin Vulgate, and partly a proper feeling of shame that the printed copy was so full of errors. The reluctance was to some extent overcome, and when Mai was dead, and his work had been mended, the book was set free. This was, as we have said, in 1857. Mai died in 1854.—*Leisure Hour*.

Lambeth Library.—The noble dining hall, with which tradition characteristically couples the name of the genial Juxon, has in our less hospitable days served as a shrine for a collection of MSS. and books, which, though legally the personal property of the archbishops, has for centuries been placed at the service of literature and the Church. The Lambeth Library was, in fact, the oldest public library in England, and the original orders for its regulation bear no less a name than that of Francis Bacon. The collection of manuscripts, some twelve hun-

dred in number, which had gathered, through the learned liberality of primate after primate, round the original nucleus of the Canterbury Registers, have long been famous among ecclesiastical and historical students, and have contributed more than any one other single source to the series of publications which have been of late undertaken by the Master of the Rolls, and such literary associations as the Camden or the Early English Text Societies. The papers of Wake, of Wharton, of Gibson, brought its interest down to far later times; while the mass of books, extending over every topic of ecclesiastical literature, comprised an almost unique series of early-printed English works, which are well known through the catalogue of Dr. Maitland. The last name reminds us how directly the library has told on ecclesiastical literature through its own custodians. The manuscript collections of Ducarel, the "Anglia Sacra," which forms but a small part of the stores accumulated by the miraculous industry of Henry Wharton, the labours of Maitland on the Dark Ages and the Reformation, are not unworthily matched in our own day by the series of works with which the present librarian, Professor Stubbs, without dispute the most learned among English historic inquirers, is enriching our national literature. To close this library to literature, and to break the learned tradition of more than three centuries, has been the last freak of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, ere they separated for their autumnal holidays. The tale, stripped of technicalities, is a very simple one indeed. An act of last session by one of its clauses expressly enabled the Commissioners, who through recent changes have become the possessors of a good half of the old revenues of the see of Canterbury, to take upon themselves the charges of the maintenance of the library and the payment of the librarian. After long and tedious negotiations they have finally refused, we believe, to allow any sum whatever for putting the library into a decent state of repair, and have offered a stipend to the librarian which is equal to the pay of a junior clerk in their office. The decision has proved too much even for the bland patience of an Archbishop of Canterbury; and we cannot be surprised that the Primate has rejected a proposal which would effectually defeat his plans for making the library of more general service to literary inquirers, and, by the decisive step of closing the library and dismissing the librarian, has at once signified his refusal to allow things to continue on their present inadequate footing, and his resolution frankly to appeal to the public to judge between himself and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.—*The Saturday Review*.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE.

~~~~~  
No. IV.—JANUARY, 1868.  
~~~~~

THE TALMUD.

SEVERAL methods are open to any one who sits down to write about the Talmud, and whichever he adopts he is secure against much adverse criticism, because very few can form an independent opinion upon his work. He may write the Talmud up, and if he has a warm imagination, a fluent pen, and some partiality, he can make it appear that the book abounds in all the graces of literary composition, in all the beauties of history and anecdote, allegory and parable, in the highest moral teaching, and the most skilful exegesis, etc., etc. He may write the Talmud down, and for this nothing more will be needful than a determined preference for its vulgarities and indecencies, its profanities and immoralities, its monstrous fables and lies, its perversion of Biblical teaching, its evasion of plain obligation, its unscientific form, spirit, and entire conception, its puerilities and its anilities, etc., etc. He may write the Talmud both up and down, by an honest selection of its repulsive and attractive elements, by a truthful exhibition of its features,—“Nothing extenuate, nor aught set down in malice.” For ourselves we are inclined to think the latter will be the course determined on by any one who has looked carefully into that most inconsistent, heterogeneous, and incongruous work; and feels that he must describe facts whoever is pleased, whoever is offended, and whatever the picture may turn out. If light and darkness, truth and

error, the beauteous and the ugly, the graceful and the grim, good and evil, alternately prevail in the Talmud, the candid reporter will say so. If as he reads he is led to fancy himself in the presence of the philosopher and the charlatan, the sage and the harlequin, the historian and the fabulist, the divine and the impious, he will say so. If he finds much that is valuable to studious and thoughtful men, and much that is simply either worthless or vile, he will say so. If he ascertains that it is a Babel in ruins, with precious relics imbedded in heaps of rubbish and dirt, he will publish the fact. If he finds what illustrates the Old and New Testament, and at the same time what looks like a burlesque, he will declare it. Whatever else is uncertain, we think, however, this is certain,—that the Talmud is a very extraordinary work, and that, taken as a whole, it is without a parallel. This conclusion will, we hope, at least be justified by the facts and illustrations which we have been at some pains to collect for the information of those who are anxious to know more about the Talmud.

It is an ancient saying that a great book is a great evil; but although the Talmud is a great book, it ought to be a good one if only a tithe of the praise which has been lavished on it be deserved. The Jews, as is well known, hold it in very high honour, and there are current among them many extraordinary opinions about it. The date of its compilation is pretty well ascertained, but there is some difference of opinion as to its origin. A popular idea is, that the Talmud is to all intents and purposes an oral law originally given to Moses, taught by him to the elders, and handed down through successive generations until it was finally committed to writing, with various commentaries and observations added by the Fathers or Rabbis of the Jews. This view of the case, which is that of Maimonides, is thus stated by a modern English Jew:—"All the commandments that were given to Moses on Mount Sinai were given to him with their proper explanations; for it is said, 'And I will give unto thee the tables of stone, and the law, and the commandments' " (Exod. xxiv. 12). By the word *Torah*, i.e., the law, is meant the written law, and by the word *Hamitzvah*, i.e., the commandment, is meant the proper interpretation thereof.

And we are commanded to keep the law according to the interpretation thereof; which interpretation is the oral law. The whole of what is called the written law, *i.e.*, the Pentateuch, which is the text, was written by Moses himself before his death; the number of copies which he wrote was thirteen; he gave one to each tribe, and one copy he put into the ark to remain there continually, according to the commandment in Deut. xxxi. 26: "Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee." But the interpretation of the law he did not commit to writing; but gave it in charge to the Elders and Joshua, and the rest of Israel, as it is said, "All the words that I shall command you, that shall ye take heed to do;" and for that reason it is called the oral law. The said oral law was what Moses continually taught in his Sanhedrim to the Elders, and the rest of the people, the manner of which was as follows:—

"As soon as Moses was returned to his tent from receiving the Word of God, he called Aaron thither unto him, and first delivered unto him the text which was to be the written law, and after that the interpretation thereof, which was the oral law, in the same order as he received both from God in the mount. Then Aaron arising and seating himself at the right hand of Moses, Eleazar and Ithamar his sons went in the next, and being taught both these laws, at the feet of the prophet, in the same manner as Aaron had been, they also arose and seated themselves, the one on the left hand of Moses, and the other on the right hand of Aaron. And then the seventy Elders, who constituted the Sanhedrim or great senate of the nation, went in, and being taught both these laws in the same manner, seated themselves also in the tent. And then entered all such of the people as were desirous of knowing the Word of God, and were taught it in the same manner. After this, Moses withdrawing, Aaron repeated the whole of both laws, as he had it from him, and also withdrew. And then Eleazar and Ithamar repeated the same, and likewise withdrew. And then the seventy Elders made the same repetition to all the people present; so that each of them having heard both these laws repeated to them four times, they all had it thereby firmly fixed in their memories. The text was put in writing, as above-mentioned, but the interpretation thereof was to be delivered down *only by word of mouth* to the succeeding generations. And towards the latter end of the fortieth

year from their going forth out of the land of Egypt, in the beginning of the eleventh month, Moses, calling all the people of Israel together, acquainted them of the approaching time of his death, and therefore desired that if any of them had forgot aught of what he had delivered to them, they should without delay repair to him, and he would repeat to them anew what had slipped their memories, and farther explained to them every difficulty and doubt which might arise in their minds concerning what he had told them of the law of God; and hereon, they applying to him, all the remaining time of his life, that is from the beginning of the said eleventh month till the sixth day of the twelfth month, that interval was employed in instructing them anew in the text, which is called the *written law*, and in the interpretation of it, which is called the *oral law*, and having on the said sixth day delivered to them the copies of the written law, as afore-mentioned, he on the seventh day went up into Mount Nebo, and there died. After his death, Joshua his successor taught the said oral law in his Sanhedrim, and delivered it to the Elders who succeeded him, as will be hereafter shewn at large.”^a

This rather lengthy extract is but the beginning of the very precise and detailed account of the transmission of the Jewish oral law from its first recipients through a long succession of persons divinely appointed to be links in what is called the “chain of receivers.” There is some dispute as to the order in which this *catena patrum* is to be constructed, but that is a matter of no vital importance. When Ezekiel is reached, we are told that the great synagogue of one hundred and twenty persons was constituted the depositary of the precious treasure, which remained intact through all changes until Rabbi Judah Hakkadosh, or the Saint, compiled the Mishna about two hundred years after Christ.

In the interval between Ezekiel and Judah several eminent Rabbis are recorded, one of them being Simon the Just, who was high priest when Alexander the Great marched upon Jerusalem. The Talmud of Jerusalem—we will explain this further on—says, “That all the time of Simon the Just the scape-goat had scarce come to the middle of the precipice of the mountain from which he was cast down, but he was broken in pieces; but when Simon the Just was dead, he fled away alive into the

^a David Levi, *Rites and Ceremonies of the Jews*, p. 223-6.

desert, and was eaten of the Saracens. While Simon the Just lived, the lot of the Lord in the day of expiation went forth always to the right hand; but when he was dead, it went forth sometimes to the right hand, and sometimes to the left. All the days of Simon the Just the little scarlet tongue looked always white, but when Simon the Just was dead, it looked sometimes white and sometimes red. All the days of Simon the Just the west light always burned brightly; but Simon the Just being dead, it sometimes burned and sometimes went out. All the days of Simon the Just the fire upon the altar burnt clear and bright, and after two pieces of wood laid on in the morning, they laid on nothing else the whole day after; but when he was dead, the force of the fire languished in such a manner that they were forced to supply it all the day. All the days of Simon the Just a blessing was sent upon the two loaves and the shew-bread, so that a portion came to every priest, to the quantity of an olive at least, and there were some who did eat, and there were others to whom something remained after they had eaten their fill; but when Simon the Just was dead, that blessing was withdrawn, and so little came to each priest, that those who were modest withdrew their hands, and those who were greedy still stretched them out." (Levi, p. 246-8.)

This Simon the Just, however, must not be dated so far back as the tradition above named would place him, but only about 180 years B.C. With him the supposed Great Synagogue ends, and the series of learned Rabbis begins. In what we may call an exhaustive article on the Talmud in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie* (vol. xv., p. 643) the writer, Pressel, gives a list of the principal Rabbis quoted in the Talmud, assigning to them the dates arrived at by Dr. Jost. The list commences with Simon the Just, who is followed by Antigonus of Socho; Zadok and Boëthus, Jose ben Joezer and Jose ben Johanan (B.C. 70; the first of the Pharisaic teachers proper), Joshua ben Perachiah, Nithai of Arbela, Simon ben Shetah, and Judah ben Tabai, Shemaiah and Abtalion (47 B.C.); Hillel and Menahem and then Shammai (about the birth of Christ). These are followed by others, who bring us down to A.D. 160, at which time we have a double series, one in Palestine, and one in Babylonia,

ending with Pumbeditha, about A.D. 500. Thus the entire range extends over about 680 years.

The Talmud is divided into Mishna and Gemara; the Mishna being the older of the two, and dating from near the close of the second century after Christ, when it was compiled by Rabbi Judah the Holy.^b The Gemara is twofold: that of Jerusalem was written late in the fourth century after Christ, and that of Babylon not completed till about A.D. 500. The Mishna, which forms the lesser portion, is a sort of text which is accompanied by the Gemara as a kind of commentary. The whole is divided into six larger portions and many smaller sections, and there are appended to it certain separate tracts which may be regarded as supplementary. Many extracts have been made from this great compilation, and the entire Mishna has been translated into Latin; but the complete work has never been translated,—nor is it likely to be.

The structure of the Talmud is thus compendiously described by Dr. Edersheim:—"Every separate traditional legal ordinance was termed a 'halacha.' The 'halachas' or traditional ordinances, in their scientific arrangement, constituted the Mishna, of which the Talmud or Gemara was the commentary, the explanation, illustration, and application."^c It must be remembered, however, that the Mishna rather *ought* to be made up of halachas than is made up of them, for they are mixed up with plenty of other matter. Nor must we fail to remind the reader that when Dr. Edersheim here calls the Gemara alone the Talmud, he adopts a not uncommon and a not commendable Jewish custom.

The character of the Talmud has been so differently estimated by different persons, that many are in doubt as to what they ought to think of it. Under the circumstances it may be needful to say something upon this point, and we will introduce our observations by an extract in which a learned Jew, M. Bedaride, controverts the hostile opinions which some have formed.

^b The notion that R. Judah did not *write* the Mishna, so far as he compiled it, is no more reasonable than that the "oral law" was handed down by word of mouth from Moses to Judah with perfect accuracy.

^c *Hist. of Jewish Nation*, p. 409.

We do not give more of his remarks than is required to shew the drift of them, but they may all be found in his *History of the Jews in France*, etc.^d He thus begins:—"Any one would be embarrassed if he had to prove that the Talmud teaches anything but the practice of all virtues: although we find in the work an infinity of things which an enlightened man and the man of good sense cannot avow. But it must be remarked that the Talmud is a collection of the opinions of a multitude of Rabbins; and in what country shall we find a multitude of men of whom some do not reason wrong? Christian theologians would not come off so well, if they were compared in this respect with the Rabbins. It might be asked in effect if the Fathers of the Church have always professed a great regard for morality, when they have spoken of heretics, if all is worthy of approval in the writings of the Escobars, the Sanchez, and the Molinas; and certainly if serious errors have fallen from some Rabbi, we should be disposed to pardon him. Happily if blameable opinions can be cited from the Talmud, they are redeemed by a mass of truths which justify it entirely in regard to morals; and it is to this mass that enlightened men ought to confine themselves, because it is not the aberrations of certain persons which can be considered as the morality of a people. He who makes this reflection will be forced to admit that it is not virtues of which the Talmud proscribes the practice, and that the morality which is called *evangelical* is found complete in the sentiments avowed by the Rabbins a long while before the appearance of the Gospel. Thus, for example, people are in the habit of repeating that the Christian religion has invented a new virtue—the love of our neighbour. This is an old error. The law of Moses and the Talmud teach that we ought to love our neighbour as ourselves: no distinction is made between the Jew and him that is not one." After quoting texts from the Old Testament in support of this last statement, to which no objection will be made, the author proceeds to cite corresponding declarations from the Talmud. One of the examples he quotes is that famous one ascribed to Hillel, not seldom as preceding the great saying of Christ: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men

^d Paris, 1859, pp. 444 *et seq.*

should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets" (Matth. vii. 12), or as given more concisely by St. Luke: "And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise." The version given of Hillel's dictum by M. Bedarride is this:—"A pagan asked of Rabbi Hillel in what the Jewish religion consisted: Hillel answered, Do not unto thy neighbour (*ton semblable*) what thou wouldest not one should do to thee. Behold, said he, the whole of religion; the rest is but the consequence." Lightfoot, who follows his original more closely, renders the passage thus: *Gentilis quidam adiit Shammæum, dixitque, Proselytum me fac, ut discam totam legem uno stans pede: retudit eum Shammæus baculo qui in manu sua. Adiit Hillelem, et ille eum proselytum fecit, dixitque, דעלך כני לחברך לא תעביר*, Quod tibi ipsi odiosum est, proximo ne feceris; nam hæc est tota lex:—"A certain Gentile went to Shammai and said, Make me a proselyte, that I may learn the whole law while I stand on one foot. Shammai thrust him away with a staff which was in his hand. He went to Hillel, and he made him a proselyte, and said, Thou shalt not do to thy neighbour what is hateful to thyself." So far as the rabbinical *precept* is concerned, it is much more like a loose copy from the book of Tobit than a pattern for the words of Jesus: "Do that to no man which thou hatest" (Job iv. 15); anyhow the apocryphal writer has a twofold advantage over the Talmudical one, for he is more ancient and more comprehensive. Hillel restricted his rule to one's "neighbour;" but the writer of Tobit, like Christ, extended it to every man. The Mosaic law enjoined that the Jew should love his "neighbour," but it remained for the Gospel to give the wide and all-embracing explanation of that word. 'We do not wish to deny the existence of large and liberal principles in the Talmud, for they are there; but the misfortune is that along with them there are other and quite incongruous utterances. If we are asked to regard the Talmud as an oral law of divine authority, or as a divinely authorized exposition of the Pentateuch and commentary upon

* Dr. Edersheim (*Hist. of Jewish Nation*) quotes Hillel as saying, "An ignorant man cannot properly abhor sin; a peasant cannot be pious; a bashful person cannot become learned." See also H. Isaacs, *Ceremonies*, etc., p. 220.

it, we shall know what to say ; we shall simply refuse to comply. But if we are merely to view it as an uncritical agglomeration of maxims, sentiments, facts, fictions, waking dreams, and wise utterances, we shall readily assent ; for this is what it is. It is the sweepings of the intellectual threshing-floor of Judaism accumulated during some centuries, and consigned to the Talmudic garner without any effectual winnowing. It is the salvage of the great wreck of Judaism, first gathered into a great heap and then roughly sorted into lots. The heterogeneous mingling of the precious and the worthless, the beautiful and the grotesque, the alluring and the repulsive, is indescribable. It forcibly reminds us of the vision of the ocean's bed as Shakespeare makes the Duke of Clarence describe it :—

“Methought I saw a thousand fearful wracks,
A thousand men that fishes gnawed upon,
Wedges of gold, great anchors, heaps of pearl,
Inestimable stones, unvalued jewels,
All scattered in the bottom of the sea,
Some lay in dead men's skulls ; and in those holes
Where eyes did once inhabit there were crept,
As 'twere in scorn of eyes, reflecting gems
That woo'd the slimy bottom of the deep,
And mock'd the dead bones that lay scattered by.”

Mishna and Gemara contain a certain amount of valuable material for the Christian student, but it costs a good deal to get it, owing to the gigantic pile of rubbish through which it is scattered. The Talmud must not for certain be compared either with the Old Testament or the New, nor be set up as a substitute for either, nor be proclaimed as the expositor and commentator of either. It gives explanations of Old Testament passages, but it excels in the delightful art of explaining away ; it gives proper glosses upon sundry texts, but it is very fond of making what is called “a guy” of them ; it supplies us with parallels more or less real and formal to a number of things in the New Testament, but distant resemblances often turn out to be a mirage.

The Talmud is very valuable as supplying illustrations of matters which the New Testament withers with sarcasm, or crushes with invective. If you want, we would say to any inquisitive

genius,—if you want to see the force of truth and the literal accuracy of the hard sayings of Christ and Paul about the Jews, priests, and people, scribes, lawyers, Pharisees, and so forth, read the Talmud. Should you be unable to read the copious and forbidding original Hebrew, take the Latin, the *Mishna* as translated by Surenhusius, or if that is too much, consult the notes of Lightfoot upon the Gospels and other books of the New Testament. You will soon discover that there was a meaning in the words of Christ, and a reason for them : because we have no doubt that the Jews of his day were like those who compiled the Talmud. A few examples are worth a long array of fine words, so we will give a specimen. Christ says, “Blessed are the pure in heart;” the Talmud says, Come and see how far the purity of Israel extends ; for not only is the clean prohibited to eat with the unclean, but the “Pharisæus seminifluus cum seminifluo plebeio.” The absence of delicacy in the portion we copy in Latin is comparatively a trifle, for the indecencies of the Talmud are wonderful. It has been said in vindication of them that the book is legal in its character, and that laws and lawyers must speak plainly on all subjects. Be it so, but it is hard to believe that the trifling with delicate topics which shocks us, is worthy of the dignity either of the lawyer or the moralist, to say nothing of the divine. If the following choice anecdote had been told of any of the founders or fathers of the Church, it would have been turned to advantage by our enemies : “Soliti sunt R. Gidal et R. Jochanan ad locum immersionis sedere, ubi lavarentur fæminæ; cumque à quibusdam monerentur de periculo lasciviæ; Respondit R. Jochanan, Ego sum ex semine Josephi in quem dominari non potuit malus affectus.” What earthly use can be made of a story like this? Even if Rabbi Jochanan told the truth, which is very doubtful, he and his friend Gidal set their disciples a most dangerous example, and yet one which they might be easily tempted to try to follow. Oddly enough the same section has been saying, “Intuens vel in minimum digitum fæminæ, est ac si intueretur in locum pudendum.” “Blessed are the pure in heart,” says Christ, but your Rabbis Gidal and Jochanan think a man may be pure in

heart while he takes no care of his eyes. The best that we can say is, that the wondrous laxity of some portions of the Talmud is compensated by the stern rigidity of others.

Christ says, "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." The Talmud says, that he who smites a man on the cheek shall give him two hundred *denarii*, but if he smites him with the other hand, let him give him four hundred. The punishments recommended for other offences are also often severe in the extreme, and not at all in the spirit of Christ.

Christ condemned the wretched trifling and punctiliousness of the Jews, and not without reason. The Talmudists excelled in the art of hair-splitting, and their observations upon certain peculiarities of the Scripture text and ritual are quite edifying. Here is one example: "The book of Deuteronomy came and prostrated itself before God, and said, O Lord of the universe, thou hast written in me thy law; but a testament which is weak in one point is weak in all. Behold, Solomon attempts to extirpate *jod* from me (viz., in Deut. xvii. 7, לֹא יִרְבֶּה נָשִׁים). The holy and blessed God answered, Solomon and a thousand like him shall perish, but a letter shall not perish from thee. R. Honna in the name of R. Achai said, The letter *jod* which God took away from the name of our mother Sarai, he gave the half of to Sarah, and half to Abraham. A tradition of Rabbi Hoshaia: The letter *jod* came and prostrated itself before God, and said, O eternal Lord, thou hast removed me from the name of that holy woman. The blessed God answered, Hitherto thou hast been in the name of the woman, and that at the end; henceforth thou shalt be in the name of a man, and that at the beginning. Hence that which is written,—And Moses called the name of Hoshea Joshua." Lightfoot, who cites this from the *Jerusalem Gemarists*, says, the Babylonians thus record the removal of *jod* from the name of Sarai to that of Joshua:—"The letter *jod*, saith God, which I removed from the name of Sarai, stood and cried to me many years, until Joshua arose to whose name I added it." All this may be very amusing to ordinary readers, and it may contain abyssees of wisdom for the

sage who can fathom it, but in any case we are happy to think the style was not followed in the New Testament.⁵

It has been said that the style of the Talmud can be compared with that of no other book. So far as the style is concerned this is hardly true, but it is allowed that no other book of so heterogeneous a character has come down to us from antiquity. The redactors did not always estimate the value of the opinions and cases they cited; they strung together the opposite opinions of their "lawyers," and put down very apocryphal cases to illustrate points of problematical importance. Mr. Bedarride does them no injustice, if he awards them no honour, when he implicitly likens the Talmudists to Escobar, Sanchez, Molina, the tribe of pettifogging and unprincipled causists pilloried by Pascal in the *Provincial Letters*. The Jesuits lay down a sound principle, and then set to work to nullify or evade it. The moral theologian, a Dens or a Liguori, propounds a law; he asks whether this is absolute or conditional, under what circumstances it is binding, and in what way it can be set aside practically, violated in the spirit and observed in the letter. He tells us that A. says something, that B. and C. are of the contrary opinion, that D. differs from the rest, and sums up by suggesting that this or that is probable. The mind is left in a fog, and the rule is mystified and made void. Something of the same sort happens with the Talmudists, who cite the most contradictory judgments, and then go on to something else, so that their reader is as wise as when he began, but a little

⁵ Those who cannot read the Talmud itself may be comforted by the information that Christian scholars in the seventeenth century devoted immense labour to its exploration, and that although what they did is not in harmony with the modes of recent scientific study, they have put into Latin or German thousands of passages from the Talmud, and thousands of observations upon its form and spirit. Ewald says: "Es ist bekannt welche ungeheure mühe sich Christliche gelehrte während des 17ten jahrh. gaben den Talmud mit allem dazu gehörigen richtig zu verstehen. In den neuesten zeiten fangen nun zwar auch Jüdische gelehrte an ihn nicht bloss auswendig zu lernen: allein wenn sie wirklich wissenschaftlich ihn erkennen und benutzen wollen, so müssen sie zuvor alle die vorurtheile ablegen welche auch denen von ihnen noch so schwer ankleben die sich gern ammeisten ihrer tüchtigkeit rühmen. Bis jetzt haben sie weder den geist des Talmuds noch auch nur die art seiner entstehung und zusammensetzung richtig begriffen."

more uncertain as to his duty. We are very glad to have their work to study in connection with the New Testament, the simple precision of which, on moral and practical questions, becomes all the more admirable when contrasted with the uncertainties and confusion of the Jewish mode. The uncertainties of this oral law might be proved by many examples. Thus, under certain circumstances a sum called *collybus* has to be paid: "is bound to pay one *collybus*. But Rabbi Meir said two *collybi*." "How much is a *collybus*? According to R. Meir it is a silver obolus; according to the wise men it is the half of one." R. Akiba lays down a rule for the payment of tithes of animals a little before the passover, Pentecost, and the feast of the tabernacles, which makes the time of payment variable: but "R. ben-Azai says the payments are to be made on Feb. 29th, May 1st, and July 29th; and Rabbis Eliezer and Simeon say, the 1st of March, the 1st of May, and the 29th of August." We naturally ask, which is to be followed?

Perhaps it would not be fair to lay much stress on the ceremonial and ritual elements of the Talmud, but as Christians, we cannot help regarding some of the items as mere petty trifling. For instance, in the section Shekalim, from which we have just quoted, we are informed that "all the spittle which is found in Jerusalem is clean, except that of the High-street. So R. Meir; but R. Jose says what is found on other days of the year in the middle of the road is unclean, but what is found at the sides is clean, and at a feast (or time of festival), what is found in the middle of the road is clean, and what is found at the sides is unclean, because few turn to the side." Again, "All the vessels which are found in Jerusalem in the way which goes down to the place of washing are unclean, but in the way which goes up from it they are clean; for their coming up is not like their going down. So R. Meir; but R. Jose says all of them are clean, except the basket, the shovel, and the bone-crusher, which pertain to burials." Again: "According to R. Eliezer, what is defiled by a father of uncleanness (*i. e.*, something in itself unclean), whether without or within, ought to be burnt without; but what is defiled by a son of uncleanness (*i. e.*, something simply polluted) whether without or within, ought to

be burnt within. But Rabbi Akiba says, where things are defiled they are to be burnt." It is no part of our business to reconcile these discordancies of judgment, which swarm in the Talmud; we only say they are there, and that they remind us much more forcibly of the Sanchez and Molina school than of the Pauline and evangelical. As for the wretched microscopic distinctions, they remind us of the many rebukes of such things contained in the New Testament.^a

But if we do not feel strongly attracted by the thousand and one examples of minute distinctions, the force of which is destroyed by contrariety of opinions, we shall not be edified by many of the curious remarks on Old Testament facts and persons. When Adam was created, he at first reached from one end of the world to the other, but after he fell into sin, God reduced his magnitude. During the one hundred and thirty years in which Adam was separated from Eve, he was the father of unclean spirits. In an elaborate article upon the Talmud in Kitto's *Biblical Cyclopædia* (New Edition), Dr. S. Davidson gives the following, which we quote because it relates to two persons mentioned in the Old Testament, "Abba Saul said: When I was an interrers of the dead, I had once to pursue after a gazelle; I entered into the hollow of a hip bone of a dead man, and ran after it three miles, and yet I reached neither the gazelle nor the end of the hip bone; when I returned back they told me this bone belonged to Og the king of Bashan. Abba Saul said: Once upon a time when I had been interrers the dead, a cave opened under me, and I found myself standing up to my nostrils in the socket of a dead man's eye; when I returned they told me it was the eye of Absalom. Perhaps thou wouldst say, Abba Saul was a short man; Abba Saul was the tallest in his generation."

The Mahommedans have appropriated some of the enormous stories of the Talmud, and have tried to improve upon their models. But where did the Jews find a precedent? If they had none, we must admire the power of their imagination, for

^a Enough of the puerile and petty distinctions of the *Mishna* to satisfy the appetite of an ordinary English reader, may be found in Wotton's translation of the two Mishnic tracts, *Shabbath and Erubin*. (8vo, London, 1718).

it is not everybody who would suppose a man's leg bone upwards of three miles in length, and so capacious that a person ran along the inside of it all the distance mentioned, and came back, and only then learned that it was a bone he had been in. The ancient mythologists produced gigantic forms which may be compared for magnitude with some of the lesser Jewish creations; but they were usually consistent, and when not grotesque were almost sublime; whereas these Jewish fables are magnified exaggerations of old wives' fables fit for the nursery, and without any colossal grandeur and poetic glory. We have copied one of Dr. Davidson's specimens, and we will quote another, because some may fancy that the vast and the rational must after all be in harmony, and that so venerated a book must have proceeded from men who did not stumble upon scientific truths by accident, but were sober plodding students. "Rabbah says: They that go down to the sea have told me that when a wave is going to overwhelm a ship, sparks of white light are seen on its head. But if we strike it with a staff on which are graved the words, 'I am that I am, Jah, Lord of hosts, amen, amen, Selah,' it subsides. They that go down to the sea have told me that the distance between one wave and another is three hundred miles. It happened once that we were making a voyage, and we raised a wave until we saw the resting-place of the least of all the stars. It was large enough to sow forty bushels of mustard seed, and if we had raised it more we should have been burned by the vapour of the star. One wave raised its voice and called to its companion, 'O companion, hast thou left anything in the world that thou hast not overflowed? Come and let us destroy it.' It replied, 'Come and see the power of thy Lord. I could not overpass the sand even a hair's breadth, for it is written, Fear ye not me? saith the Lord; will ye not tremble at my presence, which have placed the sand for the limit of the sea, by a perpetual decree, that it cannot pass.' " The moral here may be commended, but what of the fable? That reminds us of some charming passages which we have encountered among our readings in the literature of Hinduism and Buddhism. Nor is it at all beyond credibility that the precious or curious fragments of Oriental philosophy which are embedded in the Talmud,

rest side by side with metamorphosed renderings of Oriental mythography. Why not? We know very well that the rabbinical schools borrowed more than philosophical notions from countries and peoples further east than Judæa,—we know that Jewish theology was enriched in substance and in vocabulary from the same sources. It may be then, that without adapting the huge creations of Buddhism, etc., the Talmudists took them as a sort of pattern to work by, a style of literary architecture to be applied to Jewish uses. Any one who doubts the reasonableness of our supposition has only to consult very accessible books on Buddhism and Brahminism to satisfy himself upon the subject. Even Hurwitz (in his *Hebrew Tales*), has been tempted to refer to a Hindoo origin the story of the Bar Juchne, the wonderful bird which the great romancers, the Rabbins, have created and embalmed in the Talmud, until it is eaten by Israel at the advent of the Messiah. Perhaps the most plausible apology we have seen for the huge exaggerations of the Rabbins is that their lies are so immense, they could never have expected or desired to have them believed. This is an excuse which we own we should have accepted, but for the fact that the narratives in question are mixed up with opinions as monstrous as themselves, suggesting more of the charlatan than the philosopher and divine. It would be mere insincerity on our part, under all the circumstances, to palliate the vagaries of the Talmudists; and it would be impolitic, because that huge collection of wisdom and folly, of truth and fiction, which makes up the Talmud, has been at once a model and a stimulus, an excuse if not a law, to more recent Rabbis, who have vied with their forefathers in all the forms of grave and solemn trifling.

From a moral and theological point of view we observe three classes of precepts in the Talmud; those which simply repeat the Old Testament teaching; those which resemble somehow the New Testament teaching; and those which resemble neither. To the last item of this category we should refer such cold-blooded abominations as the following against heretics, from the Gemara of the Aboda Sarah: “Minim, mosoroth, apostatizers, and epicureans shall be put into a pit; and if there be in the pit a way to come up for him that is cast therein to save himself, thou shalt

fill the pit with earth, and shalt say, 'I do it only that my cattle shall not fall into it.' And if there be a stone which has covered the pit, thou shalt leave the stone, and say, 'I leave it only because I want to pasture my cattle here.' Or, if there be a ladder in the pit, thou shalt take it out, and say, 'I want it to take down my son from the roof.' " According to the *Gemara Sanhedrim*, "Rabbi Johanan said, 'A Gentile who is engaged in studying the law is worthy of death.' " There is plenty more of this sort of thing in the Talmud; and those who want to know how all the ten commandments can be violated, and how the noblest precepts of Christianity can be contradicted, need not go beyond the Talmud. The filthiness of some of the doings and sayings of the Rabbis, quoted in this strange compilation, we have already alluded to. But we cannot wonder at it if the following is not an exceptional case: "It is said that Rabbi Eleazar, son of Dordaia, did not pass a single harlot without sinning with her. Once he heard that there was a harlot in the town, near the sea, and that she took a bag of dinars for her wages; so he took a bag of money, and crossed seven rivers till he came to her," etc. (Abodah Sarah). Here is another, who was eminent in a different department: "They say that Rabbi Johanan, son of Norbai, did eat three hundred calves, and drank three hundred measures of wine, and ate forty soos of doves, for a lunch only." (Gemara, Pesachim). Admirable men of this character were, of course, the sort of people to whom Christ and the Apostles were indebted for much of their holy wisdom, and to whom we should go if we are anxious to understand properly the New Testament and its teachings!!

Perhaps we shall be more successful if we go in search of Talmudical learning and science. There is not much zoology we admit in the New Testament, but what little there is is tolerably correct. If we take the early Fathers, we may say much the same, with the exception of the phoenix, which is no more peculiar to them than to the Greeks, Romans, and Jews, all of whom had it. The race of Rabbins delighted in creating animals otherwise unknown in heaven above or earth below. Such was the wild cock, which will be mentioned again, whose feet rest upon the ground, and whose head touches heaven. Such was the ziz, a

bird of such magnitude that when it spread out its wings, the disc of the sun was obscured; such was the bar-juchne, one of whose eggs once fell down, and submerged sixty villages, and broke down three hundred cedars; such too was the bird which strode through the sea, where the water was so deep, that a voice from heaven declared how an axe, which had fallen there seven years before, had not reached the bottom, and yet the water scarcely came up to the knees of the bird. In the time of Moses there was the tachash, a creature which had one horn on its forehead, and was presented to Moses, who made the tabernacle of it. Rabbi Akiba tells of a frog, which was so prolific that it filled all Egypt; and another says, "I saw a frog, which was as big as the village of Hagaronia; and how large was Hagaronia? A town of sixty houses. And there came a dragon which swallowed the frog; and there came a crow which swallowed the dragon, and flew away and sat on a tree. Behold how great the strength of that tree! Rabbi Papa, son of Samuel, said, If I had not seen I would not have believed." This is in the section Baba Bathra; but we suppose the son of Samuel scarcely expects us to swallow it. Another Rabbi saw a kid of one day old, which was as large as Mount Tabor; "and how far does Mount Tabor extend?" he asks. "Four parasangs," is the audacious reply.

This short excursion in the domain of natural history will be sufficient to shew how far the Talmudists excelled in it. But if it be not sufficient, let the reader suspend his judgment until he has received from us a fuller account of some of the particulars, with additional examples. We have strung these together here for a definite purpose, and that is to shew what sort of notions got into the heads of those venerable Rabbis, whose work as a whole, though unread by ordinary Jews, is regarded by them as something divine. Their successors have not failed to represent the Talmudists as worthy of all credit and honour, and the Talmud as equally necessary with the Old Testament. It may be necessary to modern Judaism, but Christians may possibly dispense with it. That the Talmud is as necessary as the Bible is stated in various ways. The Bible is like water, the Mishna like wine, and the six *sedarim* (Gemara) like sweet wine: none of which can the world be without. The law is like salt, the Mishna like

pepper, and the Gemara like sweet wine ; none of which can the world be without. The man who goes from the Halachah to the Bible profits no further. If a man opposes the Rabbins it is as if he contradicted God ; and if he murmurs at them, it is as if he murmured against God. He who transgresses the words of the scribes is worthy of death. He who teaches a Halachah before his Rabbin is worthy of death. He who calls his Rabbi by name is an Epicurean, and has no portion in the world to come !

It is well to honour our teachers, but if they teach with the Talmud, what shall we do ? Now the Talmud says, there are three over whom the evil principle has not prevailed, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ; and again, Every man who says the sons of Eli sinned is in error ; and again, Every man who says Reuben sinned is in error (in reference to the translation recorded Gen. xxxv. 22) ; and again, Every one who says the sons of Samuel sinned is in error (in reference to 1 Sam. viii. 3) ; and the same is said of those who say David sinned in regard to Bathsheba, or Solomon in practising idolatry. Again, that the "Queen of Sheba" was not a woman, but a kingdom ; that God takes counsel with the angels ; that a man's star makes him wise and rich ; that usury is allowable, though forbidden by the law ; that at purim a man must drink till he does not know the difference between "cursed be Haman" and "blessed be Mordecai ;" that a man may pass all his children through the fire to Molech ; that a man who praises God too much will be excluded from the world ; and that a man must not take counsel of the devil on a Sabbath day, but may on a week day.

The admirable veracity which renders the Talmudists so trustworthy in what concerns either the New Testament or the Old is very well exemplified in what they say of the *shamir*, which they have fancied or fabled to have been a worm, by the aid of which Moses fitted and polished the gems of the ephod and the two tables of the law, and Solomon the stones of the temple. Although no bigger than a barley-corn, the shamir was so strong that, by its touch, it could make mountains start from their places, and easily split and shaped the hardest stones. In the Pirke Aboth, God is said to have created ten things on the eve of the first Sabbath, and this worm was one of them. Not much is

recorded of the manner in which Moses made the acquaintance of this wonderful being; but there are sundry stories of the way in which Solomon found it out. One of these is in the tract Gittin, and a pretty tale it is, shewing how very familiar Solomon must have been with devils and devilesses. Eisenmenger quotes this elegant specimen of Rabbinism. The sum of it is this: Solomon asked the Rabbins how he should make the temple without the use of iron. They referred him to the worm shamir, which Moses employed. How could he find it? They said he must bring a devil and a deviless, and tie them together, for perhaps they know, and will tell. So he brought the devil and deviless, and tied them together, and they said they did not know; but perhaps Asmodeus king of the devils knew. But where was he? They told him he was in a certain mountain, and had dug a hole, and filled it with water, and covered it with a stone, and sealed it with his ring, and went every day up into the firmament, and learned in the school of the firmament, and came down to earth, and learned in the school of earth; and that he came and examined his seal, and opened the pit and drank, and covered and resealed it and went away. So he (Solomon) sent Benaiah, son of Jehoiada, and gave him a chain that was inscribed with the Name (the Shem Hammphorash), and a ring, upon which was also inscribed the Name, and a little wool and wine. So Benaiah went and dug a pit under that of the devil, and let the water run off, and stopped the hole with the wool. Then he dug a pit above that of Asmodeus, and poured into it the wine, and covered it, and climbed up and sat in a tree. Now when the devil came and inspected his seal, and opened it and found the wine, he said, It is written, Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and every one that is deceived thereby is not wise. And it is written, Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart. And he drank not. But when he became very thirsty he could not restrain, and drank, and was drunk, and lay down, and went to sleep. Hereupon Benaiah came down and put the chain on him, and fastened it. When he woke, and would have broken off his fetters, Benaiah said, The name of thy Lord is upon thee; the name of thy Lord is upon thee. After this the two set out. Asmodeus comes to a date tree, which he

throws down; then to a house, which he overturns; then to a widow's cottage, and would have thrown it down, but she came out and entreated him; and as he went to cross over to the other side, he broke a bone, and said, So is it written, A soft tongue breaketh a bone (Prov. xxv. 15). When they had come to the palace, he was not brought before Solomon for three days. On the first day the devil said, Why does not the king let me come before him? They said he has been drinking too much. Then took he a brick, and set it upon another; and they went to Solomon, and told him what the devil had done; and he said, This is what he means, Go and give him more drink. On the second day he said again, Why does not the king let me come before him? They said, He has eaten too much. Then took he the brick off the other, and placed it on the ground. So they went to Solomon, and told him this; and he said, What he means is,—Give him little to eat. On the third day Asmodeus came before the king, and took a measure, and meted out four cubits, and then threw it away, and said to him, When thou diest thou wilt have but four cubits in the world. Now thou hast subdued all the world, and art still unsatisfied till thou hast conquered me also, and put me below thee. Solomon replied, I want nothing of thee; I want to build the temple, and for this I need the shamir. Then he answered, He is not mine, but belongs to the chief of the sea, and he gives it only to the *tarnegola* (cock, or wild cock), which is faithful to him, because of the egg which he had pledged to him. And what does he with it? He takes it up the mountains, where nobody can dwell, and keeps it on the mountain rock, and splits the mountain, and takes it away. Then he takes seed, and throws there, and there is prepared a place to dwell in, and hence is he called a mountain artificer. When they had found the nest of the *tarnegola* containing young ones, they covered the nest with glass. When the parent bird came, and could not get to its young, he went and fetched the shamir, and put it on the glass; but Benaiah shouted of a sudden so loud that the bird dropped the shamir, which Benaiah took up, and the bird went and hanged itself.

The *tarnegola* is usually the domestic cock, but the Rabbins have shewn their scientific tendencies by turning it into an im-

possible monster. We have had it in league with the devil ; and we find the Targumists thus making God speak in Psalm l. 11, "Known before me are all the birds of the mountains which fly in the air of heaven ; and the cock, whose feet stand upon earth, and whose head reaches into heaven, sings before me." Buxtorf quotes the second Targum of Esther as saying : "Not on the fifth day, because upon it were created leviathan and tarnegola, which were prepared for the synagogue of Israel for dinner at that great day" (the day of Messiah). Buxtorf notices that in Baba Bathra, the great bird which has its feet on earth, and its head in heaven is not called the tarnegola. We are often reminded of the use made of these fables by the Mohammedans, as when Mohammed on his night journey sees the angel of cocks, as a cock, and so large that his feet stood on the first heaven, and his head reached the second heaven, a distance of a five hundred days' journey. This is the cock which crows when God sings a hymn of a morning. In suggesting that God sings hymns again, the Mussulman reminds us of the Talmudists, who make Him pray.*

Of Solomon's other dealings with Asmodeus, we can only say that the story of them is a mixture of profanity and absurdity. For example, when Solomon frees the devil of his chain and gives him his ring, the devil throws him four hundred miles away, and he becomes a wandering beggar, etc.

We have shewn that the Talmud teaches folly as well as sin ; but if any one doubts the latter, let him read this : "Rabbi Ilea says, when the evil nature of a man prevails over him, let him go to a place where he is not known, and put on black garments, and do as his heart desires, and not profane the name of God openly." Moreover, a man is allowed to commit all the sins forbidden in the law, if he can preserve his life by such means.

* In reference to a portion of Jost's *Geschichte des Judenthums*, Ewald says : "Uebrigens hat jenes ächt Rabbinische wesen von der einen seite mit dem Päpstlichen von der andern mit dem Islam'schen die höchste ähnlichkeit : und wenn Jost dort meint der Islam habe sein bestes vom Rabbinenthume, so ist das in dem sinne in welchem er es versteht fast durchaus unrichtig, richtig aber ist nur zusehr diese innere ähnlichkeit zwischen beiden."

To folly and profanity lies must be added, or, at any rate, fictions. Some of these we have given. There are many more; one that the body of Adam was made of dust from Babylon, his head from the land of Israel, and his limbs from the rest of the world; he had two faces; his stature reached from earth to heaven before he sinned, after which God shortened him; he could see from one end of the world to the other; he would have eaten hay with his ass, etc. Og, king of Bashan, and the unicorn outlived the deluge. No wonder, if Og and the unicorn were of the huge dimensions assigned to them. It is related of Og that he wanted to throw a stone at the Israelites, and finding that their camp extended some ten or twelve miles, he went and pulled up a mountain of the same extent, and put it on his head, but God let some ants come on it, and they bored a hole in it, and it fell over his head on to his neck, and when he went to lift it off, his teeth grew out suddenly on both sides, and he could not get it off. Moses, who was ten cubits high, took an axe ten cubits long, and sprang up ten cubits into the air, and smote Og on the ankle, and felled him to the ground dead. A story almost word for word the same is in the Targum of Palestine (end of Numb. xxi).

Rabbi Johanan, one of the worst liars in the Talmud, says God told Noah to take precious stones and pearls into the ark, to give him light like noonday. Another says, "We once went into the wilderness and saw geese, whose feathers fell off for fatness, and streams of fat were running from them; and we said to them, Have we any part in you in the world to come? Some lifted up their wings, and others their foot. While I was engaged with them, Rabbi Eliezer came to me and said, Israel must give an account because of them" (*i.e.*, for causing Messiah to tarry so long, that the geese are afflicted by their fat). It was the same gentleman who saw the frog as large as a village, and the serpent, and crow, and tree, already mentioned. The tree was, perhaps, the cedar which fell down, and was so large that sixteen waggons drove abreast along it. It was the same veracious Rabbin who saw the fish which threw down sixty villages when the sea cast it ashore, which sixty other villages ate of which sixty other villages salted part of, from which the

fat of one eye filled three hundred barrels, and at the end of twelve months they saw the people collecting its bones to build again with them the towns which had been thrown down. The same old sailor saw another fish upon the back of which the sand had accumulated, and rushes had grown. "We thought it was the dry land," he says, "and landed, and cooked provisions, and sat down on it; but when it felt the fire it dived down;" and if his ship had not been at hand the narrator would have been drowned, and the world would have been deprived of the benefit of his peculiar talent. However, he survived, and at another time sailed for two days and two nights between the fins of a fish, which swam in one direction as the ship went in another. Resolved not to be outdone, Rabbi Johanan tells how he was once in a ship, and saw a fish which lifted its head above the water, and its two eyes were like two moons, and it spouted water out of its nostrils like the two streams of Sura. This reminded Saphra of a fish which he saw, which stretched out its head above the water, and had horns, upon which was written, I am the smallest creature in the sea, and am three hundred leagues in length, and go in the throat of leviathan. Rabbi Ashi, who had identified the last fish but one as a *Gildena*, whatever that is, says, this is a sea-goat, which searches about and has horns.

The idea of a fish three hundred leagues in length sailing down the gullet of leviathan, is not extravagant, and the venerable father, who, by this conception, a little exceeded his holy brethren, is the sort of man to teach Christians the meaning of the New Testament! We should have been much better pleased with Rabbi Ashi, if, instead of standing godfather to the lie, he had told us its true character. But the leviathan? modesty forbids us to repeat what is said of it, save that God has put to death the female leviathan, and salted it to feed the just in the world to come. We say the same of Behemoth, the female of which is also preserved for the great feast at the end of time. Then there is the wonderful lion, which Cæsar wanted to see. At the summons of a Rabbi the lion set out, but when four hundred leagues away roared so loud, that among other calamities the walls of Rome fell down. When three hundred

leagues distant he roared again, and people's teeth fell out, and Cæsar himself tumbled from his throne to the ground, and besought the Rabbi to let the lion go back.

These Talmudists had a rare acquaintance with the marvels of nature. They tell of a place where they saw heaven and earth touch one another; of a precious stone which restored dead fowls to life, etc. They say there were in Rome three hundred and sixty five streets, in every street three hundred and sixty-five palaces, and in every palace three hundred and sixty-five stairs, etc. In Sepphoris there were one hundred and eighty thousand streets, etc. Camels and asses are distinguished for their piety. Directions are also given for discovering and taking devils, and for rendering witches harmless.

The immoralities of the Talmud we pass over, and say nothing of the magical exploits of some of the Rabbins. It is worth noting, however, that among the latter we find some that may be compared with certain stories in the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy. Absurdity is added to absurdity until we become in doubt whether these reverend Rabbis are not positively mad. For eating, Big-bellied Ben is a child to them; for drinking, they could swallow any quantity, and their carcasses were enormous for fatness. The right sort of men for teaching pure ethics, and a spiritual religion! Excellent illustrators of the New Testament! Their indecencies and immoralities are so unutterable, that Eisenmenger himself, who gives examples of them in the original, dare not translate them, though he is not a man to stop at trifles.

The Rabbis were sometimes very capricious. There is, for example, that story of the heathen who once went to Shammai, and said to him, How many laws have you. He answered, Two, a written law and an oral one. The man said, I believe thee in that which is written, but in the oral I do not believe thee. Make me a proselyte by teaching me the written law. Hereupon Shammai was in a passion, and sent him away with a rebuff. So the man went to Hillel, the rival of Shammai, to be made a proselyte, and Hillel, as his lesson for the first day, taught him aleph, beth, gimel, daleth. The next day the man went again and got nothing better, and complained of it,

but got such a reply that he apparently declined to go any further.

It may be observed here, that although Hillel and Shammai taught many things contradictory to one another, and their followers were divided for some years, a voice from heaven (Bath col) declared the teaching of both to be alike the word of God. On other occasions, the contradictory teachings of the Talmud are admitted by itself, and God is made responsible for the contradictions. Under the circumstances, the study of the Talmud needs to be encouraged by rather strong expressions. We are therefore told this: "Our Rabbis teach that the students of the Bible do what is a virtue and no virtue, the students of the *Mishna* do what is a virtue and gain a reward, and the students of the *Gemara* perform a greatly virtuous deed."

The piety of the Mishnic and Gemaric doctors must not be taken always for granted, though we may readily predicate it of some. It is observable that a recent writer who has depicted the Talmud and Talmudists in very glowing colours, says: "When the masters of the law entered and left the academy they used to offer up a short but fervent prayer." How many of them did this? John Henry Otho, author of the *Rabbinical Lexicon, History of Mishnic Doctors*, etc., says of Nechonia ben Hakana: "Nechoniah was also accustomed contrary to the common practice, on entering the school, to utter a short prayer. When asked why he did it, he answered, 'At entering I pray God that no scandal may happen through me, and at leaving I give thanks to God for my portion which it has pleased him to bestow on me.'" This Nechoniah was no doubt a bit of a Pharisee, but that is not the question; if it was the custom for the masters to pray on entering and leaving the schools, why was Nechoniah asked to account for his doing so? When this man was old, they asked him how he came to live so long; and he said, "I have not received gifts, nor indulged my passions too much, nor sought my own glory in the shame of my companion, and, therefore, the curse of my companion has not come upon me. As far as I could I have avoided avarice," etc.

The Talmud supplies us with many remarkable specimens of Biblical exegesis. The text of the Old Testament represented

by it is not always the same as that now accepted, though the variations are probably scarcely worth the trouble of collation. But the explanations, as we must call them, of passages of the Old Testament are often very curious, if seldom profitable. With an ingenuity to which we can find no parallel, texts are strangely turned inside out, or interpreted in the most extraordinary way. They are applied to the illustration or confirmation of imaginary facts and idle fancies; moral and immoral deductions are drawn from them; and analogies of the most wonderful kind are found in them. In their pursuit of heretics alone, the Talmudists have discovered a great many allusions to them and condemnations of them which are altogether visionary. In seeking rules and definitions relating to ritual and ceremonial matters, they are perhaps even more unreasonable. In general, we may say that the Talmud is of little or no value as a storehouse of glosses and comments upon the Old Testament, because of the incurable habits of its compilers, who perverted and distorted their text without scruple and without reason.

“What is Mount Sinai? A mountain from which hatred flows down to the nations of the world.” Thus says the Talmud, and the saying is almost verified by many things reported alike of the Talmudists and their followers. It may be and it is true, that the Jews were provoked and persecuted by pagans, and by Christians eventually, though we must remember that Jewish exclusiveness is far older than the Christian era. It may be and it is true that modern Judaism is adorned by some of the noblest specimens of impartial generosity and liberality, though we must bear in mind that herein they run counter to a whole stream of writers from the Talmudists downwards. But whatever may be said to shew that the Talmudic dictum quoted above is inconsistent with others in the same work, and that it is now not much attended to, the characters drawn in the Talmud are often perfect specimens of arrogant conceit, selfishness, narrow-minded exclusiveness and bigotry, and we believe this circumstance has tended to deepen the hostility shewn to it, and to the Jews who professed to revere it.

The angelology, demonology, and pneumatology of the Talmud is another curiosity. Fancies which were current in

Babylon and elsewhere, have been grafted upon the teachings of the Old Testament, and of the whole a compound has been formed at least as strange as any product of the schoolmen in the middle ages.

We have the following specimen of truthful history in a quotation from the Talmud given by Dilherr (*Farrago Rituum*, etc.) "If any one goes forth to be stoned, a herald precedes him, crying, 'Such a one, N. the son of N., goeth forth to suffer the punishment of death because he hath committed the crime N.; and the witnesses of his crime are N. N. Whoso therefore knoweth his innocence, let him come and make it known.' The same was observed on the evening of the Passover, when the case of Jesu was in hand. But after proclamation had been made before him a whole forty days, he was led forth, who bewitched, and seduced, and provoked Israel. 'If any one, therefore, knoweth his innocence, let him come and declare it.' But they found no excuse." Now we shall quite understand the influence such a statement is likely to have upon a Jewish mind if we remember that the Talmud is supposed to embody the doctrines and learning of the Jews, as well as the principles of divine and human law. Christian readers who read this for the first time will not fail to view with suspicion the work containing it, although strongly recommended to them as furnishing excellent illustrations of the New Testament. Excellent illustrations indeed; but accidentally and not designedly.

That imitations from the New Testament are at least possible may be gathered from the Talmudic account of Rabbi Chanina son of Dusa, who, according to the *Zemach David*, lived in the time of Rabbin Johanan Zechai and Rabban Simeon son of Hillel. He taught the law along with R. Johanan Zechai, and saw the destruction of the temple and city by the Romans. Rabbi Chanina is therefore made the contemporary of Christ and his Apostles, and this is what the Jews record of him: "The fame of his piety and wisdom so spread that, according to the book Juchasin, a voice from heaven said of him, 'The whole world is cherished for the sake of Chanina my son;' and again, 'Receive admonition from Chanina my son.' A good many things are reported of this man in the Talmud, whereupon

Lightfoot says: 'De quo R. Chanina infinitæ fere occursant historiæ de editis ab eo miraculis quæ magicam sapiunt sat superque.' " It is related of him in the Mishna that when he prayed for the sick, he knew which would die, and which would recover. On being asked how he knew, he said, when he prayed freely he gathered that his prayers were accepted of God; and if not, that the sick would die. Once upon a time two of the disciples of the wise told him that the health of the son of R. Gamaliel was not good, so he told them to wait awhile till he had gone up into his chamber (upper room). When he had prayed, he came down, and said, The son of R. Gamaliel is freed from his fever; and R. Gamaliel observed that at the same hour the fever left him.

But why go further? The impeachment of the Talmud has surely proceeded far enough, and the necessary conclusion to be arrived at is that its good and truthful elements do not atone for its thousands of abominations. Those who hope to learn from it how tradition may be supported, how Ritualism may be defended, how the Fathers may be honoured, how the New Testament may be illustrated, will turn from it with unutterable dismay, disappointment, and disgust. For linguistic purposes it will be useful, like any other works in Shemitic dialects, irrespectively of their character. Men of science may learn from it what its compilers thought on scientific and philosophical subjects. The topographer will gather some useful hints; the archæologist will glean some valuable information; the historian of Judaism will learn the frightful degradation of the system; the Christian will gather sundry illustrations of New Testament phraseology and allusions, and especially of the denunciation of Jewish teachers and abuses; the moralist will find some good proverbs and maxims along with shameful sentiments; all will see that it is a work which cannot be translated honestly, decently, or safely into any modern language, and that the utmost use that can be made of it for the public is to select its best maxims and stories, and to say, These are the few grains of corn from the bushel of chaff, the few pearls from the heap of dirt. The wisdom and piety which it embodies are not fair samples of the work, and they only help to deepen

the feeling which the historical philosopher refers to, "*Omne ignotum pro mirifico!*" Let *Mishna* and *Gemara* sleep, we say, in their well-deserved obscurity; but let the world be admonished that they are what they are. Any attempt to evoke them from their lurking-places will be like charming the serpent, which is none the less a serpent for coming into the light. Of course we fear nothing from their study, which may even be a necessity for some, that men may be told the secrets which they cover. That there is good in the Talmud we have said again and again, and wish not to dissimulate; but as a work it is not a work for the world, nor would it repay many for the sacrifices involved in its study. Dr. Lightfoot tried to distil from it all he could to bear on the New Testament; and although incomplete, his volumes give the results of an honest endeavour. Dr. Gill tried to press it into the service of the Old Testament, and it is manifest that the fruit was not worth the toil. Others have done their best, but the general conclusion from a survey of them is, that whatever use may be made of the Talmud against Judaism in its traditional form, and however it may corroborate the New Testament denunciations of Rabbinical vagaries, it will not help to deprive the Gospel of its claim to surpassing excellence as the newest, brightest, and final phase of divine revelation.

There are good things in the Talmud, but they cannot claim to be older than the similar good things in the New Testament. This claim is often made, but without the shadow of justice, for no part of the Talmud was compiled until long after the Christian Scriptures, and some portions of it not till perhaps five hundred years after. That the Talmud itself refers to Rabbins who lived before or at the time of Christ, and fathers certain sayings upon them, is not demonstration, and this is admitted by some of the Jews themselves. We remember on one occasion speaking with a Jew to whom we remarked that a New Testament doctrine which he opposed was actually taught in the Talmud. His answer was, "The Talmud was not completed till some five hundred years after your New Testament, the effect of which the Jews had seen and felt; and what is more natural than to suppose that when they wrote the Talmud they imitated whatever they safely could from the New Testament?" We

are not able to answer this; on the contrary, we believe it as likely that the Talmudists owe something to Christian teaching, as that Mohammed owed something to both Talmudists and Christians. In any case the date of the Talmud and the vast range over which it professes to extend, forbid it ever being honestly employed to undermine the authority and priority of the New Testament.

With reference to the question whether the Jesu of the Talmud is the Jesus of the New Testament, the learned Jacques Gusset answers it in the affirmative, on the following grounds:—1. He is called Jesu; 2, is a Nazarene; 3, is son of Mary; 4, went into Egypt before he taught; 5, his doctrine seemed idolatrous; 6, He wrought miracles; 7, His miracles have been attributed to the name of God; 8, He was condemned by the Sanhedrim as a seducer of the people; 9, He was crucified or hanged up; 10, this happened on the eve of the Passover and the Sabbath; 11, He was related to the royal stock; 12, He had followers; 13, one of His chief disciples was Matthew and another Thaddeus.

Buxtorf has collected some curious passages bearing on the subject in his rabbinical *Lexicon* (art. *Stada*, fol. 1458 *sq.*). From the Babylonian Talmud, tract Sanhedrim, he gives an extract, describing the trial of a false teacher, which thus concludes:—“And thus did they to the Son of Stada in Lud, and hung him on the eve of the Passover. The son of Stada was the son of Pandira. Rab Chasda says the husband of Stada was Pandira [Paphus, son of Judah]. But, still, I say, Stada was his mother, that is, Mary, a plaiter of women’s hair, as they say in Pumbeditha; she turned aside from her husband.” To the word Stada they attached the idea of going astray, or conjugal infidelity. This story is cut out of the Basel edition of the Talmud; but it appears as well in the Jerusalem Talmud, where we read—“Thus did they to the son of Stada at Lud, against whom two disciples of the wise laid ambush, and brought him before the judges and stoned him.” That one version says the son of Stada was hanged, and another that he was stoned, will not surprise anyone a little conversant with the Talmud. But, again: The Babylonian Talmud says that Rab Bibi was once with the Angel of Death, and the angel said to his messenger, Go and

bring to me Mary, the plaiter of women's hair. And he went and brought him Mary the plaiter of little ones. Still again: "Rabbi Eliezer said to the wise, Did not the son of Stada bring up magic arts out of Egypt in a cutting of his flesh? They said to him, He was a fool, and proof is not sought from fools." With reference to Pandira as the name put instead of Joseph, it reminds us of the apocryphal fiction which makes Joseph himself the son of Panthera.

There are multitudes of observations in the Talmud relating to ceremonial and ritual, and of necessity technical. Among them are many which imply a certain knowledge of such things as with us are left to the medical profession. To ordinary readers these details would be simply disgusting, and all we say of them is, that whatever interest may attach to them in connexion with the history of medical science, they need not occupy the student of the New Testament. Under the same general head of matters ceremonial come sundry astronomical items, among which, however, are a few that should be known to the student of the Gospels. What is reported of sundry observances and customs, as at the celebration of the Passover, also deserves attention; but in fact the more useful details have been collected by such men as Lightfoot, and often published in books explanatory of biblical archæology.

What St. Paul meant by being in bondage to beggarly elements, may be inferred from the following, which we find among the regulations for the Sabbath in the *Mishna*. "R. Meir says, a cripple may go out (on Sabbath) with his wooden leg, and Rabbi Jose prohibits it.^f And if it (*i. e.* the wooden leg) has a cavity to receive anything soft, it will receive pollution. Beds (or cushions) will receive pollution by treading. And they (*i. e.*, the crippled) may go out upon them on the Sabbath, and may go into the Court of the Temple. The seat and crutches (of a cripple)

^f The word for "prohibit" really denotes "to bind," and is common in this sense. As denoting the imposing of restrictions, the same word is found in other dialects. This fact is very important in connection with our Lord's words, "Whatsoever ye shall bind," etc., words which have nothing to do with pardon or absolution, as claimed by some, but give the Apostles legislative power in the Church. "Whatsoever ye shall prohibit—and allow." Whether this power passed to their successors is a question of a different kind.

are polluted. They may not appear abroad with them on the Sabbath, nor go with them into the Court. Stilts (or skates) are clean, but men may not appear abroad with them." And so on *ad nauseam*.

Proverbial sayings found in the Gospels find their counterpart often in the Talmud; and there are many others, but we must be satisfied with mentioning the fact.

The following summary of observations upon the utility of the Talmud is gathered from the tract by Dilherr already quoted. The Talmud contains trustworthy relics of Jewish antiquity, fitted to condemn the unfaithfulness of later Jews, to illustrate the histories of the Old and New Testaments, and to aid in understanding the rites, laws, and customs of the older Hebrews. It embodies many sound theological principles, though often in the midst of absurd and useless matter. It is valuable for much that is juridical, medical, ethical, political, astronomical, etc. It contains useful proverbs, sentences, and apophthegms. But it is frequently absurd, frivolous, and impious. True, all is not absurd that seems so at first sight, for the Jews, like other Orientals, were fond of explaining mysteries by means of figures and enigmas, parables and fables, yet it is surely absurd to say that "God prays every day;" that he wept too late, because he had destroyed Jerusalem; that Adam was so tall that his head reached heaven; that he was created double; and that woman was formed from his hinder part. And it is frivolous to discuss whether it be lawful to snuff a candle on the Sabbath; whether wood, which has fallen into a furnace on the Sabbath, is to be left to burn; and other questions, which decency forbids us to repeat. As for the profane, we find it in the assertions that God is the cause of all sins; that he offers annually a goat for the sins he commits; that he teaches devils in heaven; that he plays with Leviathan like a girl with a doll; that Jesus was the son of a public harlot; that he worshipped images; that he practised enchantments; that when once recalled from hell by a Rabbi, who used magic, and asked him how he was punished, he replied that he was boiling in a brazen vessel of seething dung, etc. With respect to this last abomination, it has been pleaded in excuse that it refers to some other Jesus, who lived above a hun-

dred years before Christ, a device which we can only regard as indicative of a less savage spirit among our Hebrew friends.

After such a summary, unsophisticated people will be ready to exclaim, Thus far, certainly, the Talmud seems admirably fitted to illustrate the New Testament, and especially such passages as those in which the Scribes and Pharisees are held up to eternal infamy, for mixing up error with truth, and evil with good. The twenty-third chapter of Matthew appears to be no dead letter, no passionate exaggeration, but a picture photographed from the life. Yet some may still feel inclined to comply with the Talmudic recommendation: "Let a man always divide his years into three portions, a third for the Bible, a third for the *Mishna*, and a third for the Talmud." If after all the labours of Maimonides, there are those who will dip into *Mishna* and *Gemara*, they must find in it a huge amount of intellectual folly, filth, and rubbish, whatever else they may discover.

There is reason to believe that one of the best, and certainly one of the most interesting uses to which the Talmud can be put, is to ascertain its bearing upon the constitution of the Apostolic Church, its officers, rites, and ceremonies, and upon the phraseology of the New Testament, where it differs from that of the Law and the Prophets. Under these heads we believe some light might be thrown upon the subject of baptism and the Lord's Supper, on the orders of the ministry, on the mode of conducting divine worship, etc. Nor let any be scared from such inquiries, because the synagogue services of the later Jews differed as much from those of the Temple in its glory, as a Primitive Methodist chapel differs from a cathedral. It is necessarily true that the early converts to Christ transferred many things from Jewish forms and arrangements, and adapted them to Christian purposes. And no one surely will pretend that the constitution and rites of the Church were originally either elaborate or gorgeous. The Talmud may partly help to realize what the Church was at its outset, and partly the course which it pursued on its way to a more artificial and sumptuous state of being.

We hear a good deal in our days about science and faith,

^f Here, as very often, "Talmud" is equivalent to "*Gemara*," although properly inclusive of both *Mishna* and *Gemara*.

and we may notice that in the Talmud the two are often combined and seldom fall out. But what science! and what faith! In his notes on Matt. xxiv. 24, Lightfoot quotes these for another purpose:—"Let a man observe his good dreams till he is twenty-two years of age, after the example of Joseph. If you go to bed merry, you will enjoy good dreams. There were twenty-four interpreters of dreams at Jerusalem; and I, when once upon a time I had dreamed a dream, went to all of them, and what this interpreted, that did not interpret; yet all things happened which all had interpreted.—Let no one go out on Sabbath wearing a charm, if it is not one prescribed by an approved physician.—Let them not say a hymn over a wound on the Sabbath. That also which is repeated over the mandragora is prohibited (on Sabbath). If anybody say, 'Come, and repeat a verse over my son, or lay the book on him, or phylacteries, that he may go to sleep,' it is forbidden (on the Sabbath). Twenty-four of the school at Lydda all perished by the evil eye. R. Joshua beat a magician by magic, and sank him in the sea. Forms of incantation occur, to be said over sores, against mad dogs, against the devil, and even in the name of Jesus. The Rabbis could procure rain almost whenever they liked by the simple expedient of fasting and prayer."

Now it is very apparent that, although for sacred purposes it was counted very important to be acquainted with natural phenomena, especially times and seasons, and with the diagnosis of diseases, etc., Jewish science did not aim at much beyond these necessary things. Praise what is good, we may and must, but when we find the most wretched astrology and fortune-telling, and the most miserable superstitions as to the cause and cure of diseases, we feel that our praise must be with discrimination. The astronomical calculations involved some observation of nature, and some skill in arithmetic, and so of the rest; but he would be a bold man who asserted the Jewish science represented by the Talmud to be better than that represented by the general literature of the same period. Any one who doubts the correctness of this judgment will be convinced we think by a little reflection on the writers in various departments of science who flourished in the Gentile world, while the Jewish doctors

were creating the materials for the Talmud. It is not denied that the astronomers and physicians of Greece and Rome and Asia were superstitious and credulous, but it is maintained that Talmudical superstition and credulity find no parallel in literature produced West of Palestine. Certainly we do not find it in Vitruvius, Celsus, or Censorinus, in Galen, Hippocrates, or Ptolemy. The crop of idle fables and superstitions was plentiful enough of course in all the West, but its growth was checked by various influences, one of which was Christianity. In the far East it was not so. From Persia to China and Japan, the Zoroastrians, the Buddhists, and the Hindoos, not only rivalled the Jews in scientific and literary excellence, but in superstitious credulity. The example proves that the study of astronomy and mathematical sciences, and the elaboration of a microscopic ceremonialism, do not necessarily induce a healthy working of the reason and the imagination in all departments. If not the compilation of the Talmud itself, yet the influence of the school it represented, at once encouraged and restrained speculation and scientific enquiries in Islam and in Christendom. More than that, it generated a whole forest of fables to which Christian and Mussulman alternately stood sponsor. The Mishnist and Gemarist doctors are the true fathers of many absurd stories told in the apocryphal books which infested and defiled the Church from the days of the Gnostics onwards ; and to the same doctors Mohammed and his disciples were indebted for absurdities which bestud the Koran, and which abound in their traditional books. Along with these things, we say again, valuable lessons were often conveyed, and so far as those lessons—whether in sacred, moral, or physical science—are concerned, we are thankful for them. But taking the Mishna and Gemara as a whole, traditional Judaism would not find its best friend in the man that recommended the general study thereof. The barbarous and grotesque forms of thought and speech, the false, foul, and profane sentiments, the puerile, and irrational reasonings, the Jesuitical, crafty, and hair-splitting distinctions, the idle tales, the monstrous fables, the many abominations, make the search for golden sentences a wearisome and ill-requited toil.

**DE CONJECTURÆ OPE IN NOVI TESTAMENTI EMENDATIONE
ADMITTENDA.**

QUANTOS illi operæ suæ fructus reportaverint qui codicum manuscriptorum copias et alia quæ ad textum Novi Testamenti emendandum stabiliendumve pertinent, colligendi curam susceperunt, satis norunt omnes, qui vel primoribus, ut aiunt, labris hanc doctrinæ particulam gustaverunt. Tanta enim fuit in his rebus virorum eruditorum diligentia, ut in hac sola materie plura longe et meliora quam in ullo profano scriptore emendandi subsidia in promptu habeamus. Nec dubitari potest quin si quis universam illam supellectilem respiciat, quam ad omnium quot unquam vixerunt scriptorum interpretationem eruditi collegerunt, eam quæ in hoc solo argumento versatur reliquam istam omnem longe exsuperare facile intelligat.

Quid a singulis illorum præstitum fuerit qui provinciam hanc sibi tractandam susceperunt hujus loci exponere non est. Omnes autem in hoc consentientes videmus ut comparatis inter se codicum diversorum lectionibus, eam demum in textum inferrent quæ maximam auctoritatem haberet. Qua ratione quum tantum profecerint, ut scriptores sacros hodie longe accuratiores quam antea legere possimus, tum non ita illos omnibus numeris absolutos reddiderunt, ut nihil quod eruditorum curas adhuc efflagitet omnino supersit.

Lectionis Novi Testamenti fontes præcipui sunt tres: codices manuscripti, scriptorum veterum quæ supersunt monumenta, et versiones antiquæ. Codicum manuscriptorum ea est ratio, ut ab autographis longo temporis intervallo segregati, ipsam auctoris manum indubia fide nobis repræsentare nequeant. Nam qui ex his sunt vetustissimi, sæculum post Christum quartum rarissime assequuntur. Nec etiam his ipsis illibata sua conservatur integritas: nam etiam in optimis multa correctæ, multa subinde interpolata invenimus: nec ista utrum a primi descriptoris manu, an a recentiore quodam correctore profecta fuerint, satis certo sæpe dignosci potest. Igitur non plures solum codices inter se discrepantes, sed eundem haud raro codicem ipsum sibi contradicentem habemus. Glossemata denique, seu notationes breves a legentibus in margine exemplarium suorum

obiter exaratas, tum loca quæ vocant parallela aliunde sæpe in textum intrusa videmus, ita ut quæ pro ipsius scriptoris verbis habenda sint, quæ postea extrinsecus introducta fuerint, difficillima sæpe fiat judicatio.

Quæ quum ita sint, sagacitati illorum qui in artis Palæographicæ rudimentis studia sua posuerunt, quantum Novi Testamenti emendatio debeat nemo est qui ignoret. Sæpenumero enim temporis decursu tanta manuscriptis facta est injuria, ut quid, vel quo tempore quid scriptum fuerit, vix agnoscere possimus. Palimpsestos autem si respicias, quam horrendus in vetere lectione e tantis tenebris in lucem extrahenda labor insumendus fuerit, facile intelligi potest: nam sæpe vel summa cum animi tum oculorum intentione utentibus, quid primum scriptum fuerit vix et ne vix quidem expiscari licet: ut non aliquid post tot eruditorum labores etiamnum deesse, verum potius aliquid omnino fructus inde redundasse mirari possimus.

Codicum manuscriptorum, si in universum spectentur, duplex est genus: alterum vetustiorum, vel illorum saltem quos vetustiorum nomine eruditorum sententia insignivit: alterum illorum, qui, temporis rationem si habeas, secundas tantum partes sibi vindicare poterunt. Illorum, ut fert rei natura, paucissimus est numerus: quum plerique omnes vel incuria vel temporis injuria interciderint. Horum contra longe uberrima est copia: pretium autem si spectes, hi cum vetustioribus illis haudquaquam comparandi erunt. Excipiuntur tamen ex his nonnulli, quos ex vetustiori aliquo codice qui dudum periit, descriptos fuisse colligi potest: quod si ita esse appareat, eadem fere, quæ vetustiori illi, modo oculis eam usurpare possemus, auctoritas deberetur, et huic recentiori assignanda erit.

Sequuntur versiones antiquæ, quorum nonnullæ textum, quem interpretes præ manu habebat, adeo ad verbum repræsentant, ut ex versionis serie quæ lectio in textu isto comparuerit, sæpe conjectare possimus. Quod si ita se habeat, versio hujusmodi tantum non textus ipsius instar erit. Aliæ contra textum suum longe minus fideliter interpretari solent. In omnibus autem easdem dubitandi causas inesse videmus: nam omnes eodem, quo textus ipse, unde ortum suum habuerunt, macularum genere foedatas invenimus: adeo ut quæ vera sit in versione loci alicujus

lectio haud raro prius dijudicandum veniat, quam de textu, unde versio ista est desumpta, conjecturam satis certam facere possimus.

Scriptores denique antiqui, qui sub Patrum nomine circumferuntur, tertium lectionis fontem nobis suppeditant. Nam in scriptis illorum Novi Testamenti loca tam crebro citantur, ut vix dubium sit quin si totum Novum Testamentum casu aliquo periret, ex operibus illorum integrum fere restitui posset. Non una autem et hic nobis occursat difficultas. Nam certum esse nequit, scriptores illos ipsum codicis, quem lectitare solebant, textum ad verbum dedisse: immo pluribus in locis suspicari licet eos sensum potius quam ipsissima scriptoris verba nobis conservasse. Accedit, quod scriptorum horum codices, æque ac versiones antiquæ, describentium erroribus scatere solent: nec dubium esse potest, quin Novi Testamenti citata ista a correctoribus ad textum qui ipsis notissimus esset, sæpenumero reformatæ fuerint. Unde colligi potest, auxilium quod ex citatis istis criticos in usus peti potest, et per se esse incertissimum, et non nisi maxima cum cautela ad textum emendandum adhiberi posse.

Ex his igitur quæ leviter tantum perstrinximus, satis, opinor, apparet, in quam difficili et lubrico labore versentur illi, qui codicum manuscriptorum ope textum Novi Testamenti emendandum suscipiunt. Ergo mirum esse non potest, post tantos editorum conatus, qui omnes, ut textus emendatissimus prodiret, summo opere laboraverunt, ne unum quidem ex omnibus cum reliquis consentientem inveniri. Immo quot editiones, tot textus habemus.

Ex hac autem tanta editionum varietate et hoc inter alia incommodi sequitur, ut studiosorum vulgus, quorum res magis quam verba attendere intersit, ad quamnam ex his omnibus potissimum se recipiant, incertum reddat;

Ceu stat, et incertus quo sit sibi nescit eundum,

Cum videt ex omni parte viator iter.

Quod autem opinantur scilicet, si modo ex editionibus istis recentissimam quamque sibi comparaverint, se ita demum textus verba purissima et emaculatissima esse habituros, vereor ne ista sæpe illos fallat opinio. Nam editores isti, dum omnia e variis

manuscriptorum lectionibus in textu constituendo pendere faciunt, nimis fidenter suis videntur argumentis inniti. Nam quamvis haud diffitear, indicia esse haud pauca, ex quibus quid melioris frugis, quid nullius plane pretii criticam in partem sit æstimandum, aliquatenus hariolari possis, hæc tamen vix aliud efficiunt quam ut lectionem aliquam, si criticæ rationes solæ spectentur, aliis probabiliorē esse demonstrent. Quod si quis ulterius pergat, et indicia hæc tam certa esse affirmet, ut lectio etiam per se minus probabilis, si modo ex manuscriptorum comparatione optima videatur, hanc solum ob causam pro vera necessario sit habenda, eum fucum sibi facere quovis pignore contenderim. Neque enim regulæ ullæ in lectionibus dijudicandis poni possunt, quæ non tanto sint exceptionum numero obnoxie, ut singulis in locis iudicio opus sit limatissimo, ut utrum regula aliqua observanda negligendave sit demum dijudicari possit.

Sic, ut exemplo rem planiorem faciam, Griesbachius istam inter alias regulam protulit, “breviorem lectionem longiori esse anteferendam;” huic scilicet argumento innixus, librarios scriptoris verbis addidisse aliquid quam omisisse veri esse similis. Quod quidem, si rem in universum spectemus, verum esse potest: nec adeo tamen verum, ut contrarium omnino excludat. Nam illud in omnes scriptores, etiam in illos qui brevissima et maxime densata utuntur oratione, cadere apertum est, ut nunc plura quam quæ ad mentem suam explicandam sunt necessaria, exprimere malint, nunc contra quæ ad argumenti vel narrationis suæ plenam notitiam opus sunt, lectoribus supplenda relinquunt. Quî ergo certo scire possumus utrum in hoc vel in illo loco scriptor aliquis brevius aut plenius loqui voluerit?

Idem et de cæteris, quas commenti sunt Griesbachius aliique qui easdem in partes iverunt, regulis tenendum erit; quas quum Griesbachii liber omnium in manibus teratur, hic pluribus commemorare non est opus: et miror Alfordio operæ pretium visum fuisse, ut talia exscribendo lectores suos moraretur. Omnes autem hæ regulæ ita comparatæ videntur, ut nonnihil veritatis habeant, nec tamen adeo certæ sint, ut tota critices ratio ab iis pendere debeat. Quicquid autem de regulis hujusmodi statuas, illud tamen de scriptoribus omnibus cum sacris

tum profanis qui ætatem tulerunt, audacter dixerim, fieri non posse ut lectio sit vera quæ non probabilem secum sententiam conjunctam habeat. Probabilem autem eam voco, quæ per se sit veri similis et scriptoris menti accommodata. Dixeris fortasse scriptores sacros in ejusmodi argumento versari, quod captum nostrum longe superet, et ideo fieri non posse ut ea quæ in tali argumento scripta sint a nobis semper intelligantur. Hoc autem argutari magis quam argumentari est. Aliud enim est de rebus obscuris, aliud obscure loqui. Nam scriptores sacros, ubi de rebus obscurissimis loquuntur, sæpe verbis apertissimis et simplicissimis uti videmus. Est et quædam judicandi facultas qua dignoscere possumus utrum obscuritas ista in rebus an in verbis potius delitescat. Verba autem si præfracte retinemus, ubi unius fortasse literulæ mutatione sensus juvari potest, quid hoc tandem est nisi scriptoribus injuriam facere? Loca autem aliquot apponam, ubi nimia manuscriptorum codicum reverentia editores in fraudem videtur induxisse.^a

^a Matt. xi. 2. Pro πέμψας δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ scribere malunt πέμψας διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν, quia hoc in codicibus aliquot antiquioribus legitur. Verum quum Luc. vii. 19, *duos* fuisse missos diserte tradat, longe verisimilius videtur librariorum δύο et διὰ confudisse, quam Matthæum illud omisisse. Quæ contulit Alfordius tam nihil ad rem faciunt ut mireris eum talia attulisse. xviii. 28, ἀπόδος δέ τι ὀφείλεις. Scribunt εἴτι cum codicibus. Verum εἴτις pro δστις non iis in locis dici potest, ubi de re tanquam certa loquitur scriptor. Ratio quam comminiscitur Alfordius, quamobrem εἴτι præferendum putet, a sacri scriptoris simplicitate prorsus abhorret. Luc. ii. 14, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας. Verum ex ipso rhythmō sententiæ, quod haudquaquam in his negligendum est, vides quam inconcinne εὐδοκίας legatur. Vide simile exemplum concinnitatis prorsus pessundatæ Matt. xi. 9. x. 15, καὶ σὺ Καφερναοὺμ, μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθῇ; ἕως Ἀδου καταβιβασθῇ. Hæc rhetorem potius quam Evangelistam sapiunt. μὴ ex ultima μ proxime præcedentis Καφερναοὺμ ortum suum videtur habuisse. Alfordius etiam in Matt. xi. 23, μὴ edidit, ubi recte Tischendorfius vulgatam retinuit. In xiv. 34, οὖν quod sententiam prorsus turbare videtur ex ον in καλὸν irrepsisse credo. Miror Alfordium ita explicantem quasi Christus dixisset, "Recte se ergo habet proverbium, καλὸν τὸ ἔλας." 2 Pet. ii. 13, μῶμοι ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν; coll. Jud. 12, οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες. Hæc alterum ab altero exscripsisse per se patet. Criticis tamen rationibus obsecuti ἀπάταις in Petri, ἀγάπαις in Judæ loco legunt: quod veritati parum convenire ipse fatetur Alfordius. Dispiciendum erit utrum ἀπάταις an ἀγάπαις in utroque loco melius conveniat: nam ἀπάταις in hoc, ἀγάπαις in illo legere nihil est nisi lectoribus illudere. Π et Γ et Τ facillime confunduntur. Rescribendum utrobique ἀγάπαις. 2 Tim. iv. 1, Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ., καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ. Quo tandem sensu? Rescribendum κατὰ pro καὶ cum aliquot manuscriptis.

Hæc quæ dixi si recte sunt disputata, sequitur infirmam esse eorum sententiam qui sola lectionum comparatione quæ vera sit extra controversiam definiri posse arbitrantur. Neque enim certa ulla regula poni potest qua res ista ad liquidum perducatur. Nam si dixeris lectionem quæ in optimis codicibus invenitur, eam demum optimam esse judicandam, in singulis tamen paginis discedendum erit, et quam lubrica sit hujusmodi regula, statim apparebit. Nec aliter se unquam res habitura esse videtur, nisi codices ætate longe illis quos hodie habemus antiquiores inventi fuerint: cujus rei, quantum quis conjectare potest, nulla est expectatio.

Quid ergo? Post tot tantosque in hæc studia ab eruditis collatos labores, adeone nihil fructus studiosorum in usus redundavit? Immo maximus: non qualem tu, fortasse, lector optime, expectasses, æque tamen magnus, et æque magni æstimandus. Namque ex editorum collationibus illud tanquam certissimum sequitur, inter tantam lectionum multitudinem, quam omnem fere calculum exsuperantem videmus, vix unum alterumve inveniri locum, ubi sensus ullam quæ quidem alicujus sit momenti, mutationem patiatur: immo tam leves, loci sententiam si spectemus, sunt pleræque omnes varietates istæ, ut hanc vel illam in textum recipias ne hilum quidem referre videamus. Hoc igitur qui Theologiæ studiosis fideliter inculcaverit, et quam nihil ad Novi Testamenti auctoritatem elevandam omnes istæ varietates valeant, exemplis satis luculentis demonstraverit, næ ille adjumentum si quid video longe majus studiosis attulerit, quam si prolegomena et apparatus criticos, et cætera quæ sunt ejusdem farinae ad nauseam usque coacervaverit. Vereor equidem ne editiones istæ, in quibus talia studiosorum in commodum digesta, ut amant loqui, exhibentur, plus damni quam utilitatis secum lectoribus afferant. Scilicet hæc ad Criticorum potius quam ad Theologorum studia pertinent. Nam Theologiæ quidem studiosis satis erit si rei criticæ principia summatim tantum et in genere didicerint, et cujus generis argumentis Novi Testamenti textus auctoritas innitatur, notitiam sibi aliquam comparaverint. Singulas autem lectiones exhibere, nisi aliquam sensus mutationem secum conjunctam habeant, nihil omnino, ut mihi videtur, utilitatis affert. Critici enim,

quibus harum rerum satagere curæ est, ad illorum opera qui ipsos codices proprio Marte inspexerunt, libentius confugiunt, nec digestis multum confidunt: nam in hoc, ut in aliis rebus, verissimum est quod ait poeta,

Dulcius ex ipso fonte bibuntur aquæ.

Venio nunc ad aliud emendandi instrumentum, quod ab hodiernis editoribus non eo quo dignum est pretio haberi videtur. De eo loquor quod positum est in iis locis conjecturæ ope sanandis quibus meliorem medicinam aliunde sperare non licet. Illud autem editoribus plerisque omnibus adeo fastidium movet, ut quicquid virorum doctorum sagacitas hanc in partem attulerit sicco pede prætereuntes ne verbulo quidem dignentur commemorare: Griesbachii, ut videtur, exemplum secuti, qui olim in textu constituendo regulam hanc sibi fecit, ut nihil e conjectura admitteretur. Factum est autem, ut iis sæpenumero usu venit, qui aliorum vestigiis insistunt, ut isti ulterius longe quam ipse Griesbachius progredierentur: nam Griesbachius quidem, quamvis nihil in textum, quod non manuscripti alicujus auctoritate comprobatum esset, admittendum judicaret, (quod recte consultum arbitror) in notis tamen eas virorum eruditorum conjecturas quæ commemoratione dignæ viderentur, fideliter consignavit, et lectoribus suis bonæne aliquid frugis subesset an non, judicandi potestatem fecit. Hodierni autem, dum manuscriptorum lectiones etiam ineptissimas omittere religioni habent, quicquid e conjectura profectum fuerit, rarissime, et quasi aspernantes, indicare solent. In quo tamen, nisi vehementer me fallit animus, maxime erratur.

Nam ea est omnium veterum scriptorum conditio, ut conjecturæ, si modo eos intelligere velimus, auxilio aliquando egeant. Aut igitur sumendum, aliam esse Novi Testamenti, aliam omnium reliquorum scriptorum rationem, aut quod in omnibus aliis scriptoribus usu venit, idem et in sacros scriptores cadere fatendum erit. Accipe, si vis, Sophoclem, Æschylum, Euripidem, Aristophanem; et ea lege eorum quemlibet restituendum suscipe, ut nihil nisi quod manuscriptorum auctoritate comprobatum sit in textum recipias. Dele omnia quæ Porsonus, Elmsleius, Hermannus, et alii ex ingenio emendaverunt: ut textum solo manuscriptorum codicum auxilio emaculatum habeas.

Habeas tecum servesque. Nam talem mehercules Æschylum, Aristophanem, Euripidem habebis, qualem nec intelligere ipse poteris, nec scriptores isti, si in vivis adhuc essent, unquam agnitori essent. Constat autem inter omnes, qui in his rebus iudicio pollent, scriptores sacros, quum libros suos consignassent, eadem plane ac alios omnes fata fuisse expertos, nec ab erroribus istis, quos tempus et incuria cæteris omnibus scriptoribus inolevit, carere potuisse. Igitur nisi ad miracula confugiamus, et veram Novi Testamenti lectionem ipso Deo illud ita volente (quod ne censeamus plurimæ eædemque difficillimæ rationes obstant), in manuscripto aliquo semper conservatam fuisse statuamus, fatendum erit etiam sacros scriptores, sicut cæteros, iis in locis ubi veram lectionem prorsus periisse apparet, conjectura, si modo restitui possunt, restituendos esse. Nec video quare tantas in hac re turbas viri docti excitaverint. Nam ex omni ista lectionum farragine, ex qua textum nobis conflamus, nonnisi unam veram esse posse, et ab auctore profectam, per se est apertissimum. Ab hac autem si discesseris, quid aliud sunt reliquæ omnes istæ, nisi librariorum conjecturæ, quibus singuli eum quem ad manum habebant textum refingendum arbitrabantur? Nec causam intelligere possum quare tantam veterum exscriptorum conjecturis in locis dubiis auctoritatem tribuamus, eas autem quas eruditi recentiores iis in locis protulerunt, quæ sine conjectura recte intelligi non possunt, hanc solum ob causam, quia conjecturæ sunt, nihili prorsus esse contendamus.

Hæc fere sunt quæ dicenda habui. In iis quæ dixi illud potissimum mihi propositum fuit ut conjecturæ eum quem in omnibus reliquis scriptoribus locum habet, et in Novi Testamenti emendatione vindicarem. Neque tamen hæc ita intelligi velim quasi ad conjecturam, nisi in locis pæne conclamatis, et ubi res, ut ita dicam, ad triarios videtur rediisse, confugiendum censeam. Neque enim is legitimus conjecturæ usus est, ut scriptores antiquos elegantius vel magis concipne loqui faciamus: verum ut quid scriptor aliquis dicere voluerit idonea ratione intelligi possit. Ad meas conjecturas quod attinet, non adeo mea mihi placent ut non tibi, lector, si meliora attuleris, gratias agam quam maximas. Quæ mox sequuntur (plures fortasse futuræ nisi chartarum modulus quem in hisce scriptitandis, nimius ne

essem, mihi servandum duxi, illud vetuisset) pro auctariolo illarum accipiendæ erunt quas paucis abhinc mensibus studiosorum in manus dedi. Eas autem quum eruditis haud displicuisse intellexerim, alia fortasse, lector, si res ita tulerit, alio tecum tempore communicabo. Vale.

GULIELMUS LINWOOD, M.A.

Ædis Christi nuper Alumnus.

Scripsi mense Martio ineunte MDCCCLXVI.

Mar. xii. 4, *καὶ κεῖνον [λιθοβολήσαντες] ἐκεφαλαιώσαν*.—Frustra in explicando *ἐκεφαλαιώσαν* laboratur. Legendum *ἐκολάφισαν*. Cf. Matt. xxvi. 67; infra xiv. 65.

Actor. i. 9, *καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν βλέπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη*.—*ἐπήρθη* de iis dicitur qui aliorum manibus sublati sublimes feruntur: quod quam ab hoc loco alienum sit quivis videt. Scriptores sacri ubi de Christo in cælos suscepto loquuntur semper *ἀνελήφθη* dicunt. Cf. Mar. xvi. 19, supra i. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 16. Legendum omnino *ἀπήρθη*, i. e., “ablatus est:” sicut in codice Cantabrigiensi legitur. Cf. loca apprime huc facientia Matt. ix. 15; Marc. ii. 20; Luc. v. 35.

Actor. xxvi. 3, *μάλιστα γνώστην ὄντα σε πάντων τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἔθων τε καὶ ζητημάτων*.—*ἐπιστάμενος*, quod post *ζητημάτων* habet codex Alexandrinus, et nonnulli post *μάλιστα*, sensui necessarium videtur, et propter literarum in *ΜΑΛΙΣΤΑ* et *ἐΠΙΣΤΑμενος* similitudinem fortasse omissum fuit. Accusativi absoluti, quali plerique hunc locum explicandum putant, frustra in Novo Testamento exempla quæsi: neque aliorum scriptorum usu defendi eum posse arbitror. Similis locus supra xxiv. 10, *ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν ὄντα σε κριτὴν τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ ἐπιστάμενος, εὐθύμως τὰ περὶ ἑμαντοῦ ἀπολογοῦμαι*. Quæ tanquam similia comparavit Alfordius aliena sunt.

Eodem modo, ni fallor, emendandus est locus Æschyli Supplicum v. 293, ubi nunc legitur sine sensu, *ἦν, ὥς μάλιστα καὶ φάτις πολλὴ κρατεῖ*. Legendum enim, *ἦν, ὥς ἐπίστα, καὶ φάτις πολλὴ κρατεῖ*. Ignoscet lector si hac occasione et alium ejusdem tragœdiæ locum emendare tentabo. In v. 265, legitur *τὰ δὴ παλαιῶν αἱμάτων μιάσμασι χρανθεῖσ' ἀνῆκε γαῖα μηνέται*

ἄκη. Legendum puto γαῖα μηνύσας ἄγη. Vulgatam corruptam esse et sensus et metri hiatus arguunt.

Rom. iii. 9, τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως προητιασάμεθα γάρ, κ.τ.λ.—προεχόμεθα vox nihili est, pro qua legendum videtur προέχομεν. Passiva terminatio procul dubio ortum habuit e mox sequente προητιασάμεθα, quod describentis oculum in fraudem induxerit. Sensus est, interpunctione post τί οὖν collocata: "Quid ergo? num meliores sumus Judæi, quia τὸ περισσὸν istud (v. 2, seqq.) habemus? Haudquaquam: nam utrosque, tum Judæos tum alios," etc.

2 Cor. ii. 1, ἔκρινα δὲ ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο.—Legendum ἐν ἐμαυτῷ. ἐν propter primam sequentis ἐμαυτῷ syllabam excidisse videtur. ἐν alibi in similibus utitur Apostolus. Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 37. ἔκρινα ἐμαυτῷ solœcum est.

2 Cor. viii. 2, ἡ περισσεῖα τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν.—Quid sit ἡ περισσεῖα τῆς χαρᾶς vix intelligo. Legendum arbitror τῆς χάριτος cum codd. recentioribus nonnullis.

Gal. ii. 5, οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἵξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ.—Legendum ἐπιταγῇ pro ὑποταγῇ. εἶκειν ὑποταγῇ quid sit intelligi nequit. Locus autem e difficillioribus. Nam utrum Titus circumcisis fuerit an non, ex historia non liquet: et verba Apostoli si spectemus, ambigua est interpretatio. Mihi ea ratio verior videtur quæ περιετμήθη post v. 4 supplet, ut Titum circumcisum quidem fuisse, sponte autem illud, nec necessitate coactum, Paulum fecisse intelligatur. Structura similis est in 1 Cor. vii. 1, καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἰδίαν γυναῖκα ἔχέτω. Matt. xxiv. 22, εἰ μὴ ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι.

Loci autem sententiam si spectemus, maxime conveniens videtur hæc interpretatio: illud enim agit Apostolus, ut doceat, Titi circumcisionem non ita factam esse quasi ab instituto suo, sc. gentes non esse circumcidendas, discessisset, verum id se sponte fecisse, ne cavillandi occasionem quibusdam daret. Quod innuit postea, dum dicit, οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὥραν εἵξαμεν τῇ ἐπιταγῇ, i. e. "quibus concessimus quidem, verum non quasi imperio eorum obsecuti."

Phil. ii. 16, λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες.—ἐπέχοντες vereor ut

recte se habeat. Namque usus iste quo “porrigere, tanquam poculum alicui ad bibendum,” significat, licet Homero frequentatus, posterioribus ignotus erat. Legendum suspicor λόγῳ pro λόγον. Cf. Act. iii. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 16.

Jac. iii. 6, ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας, κ.τ.λ.—ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας quo sensu idoneo dici possit nescio. Facit autem inconcinna totius orationis conformatio ut aliquid corruptum vel luxatum putem. Conjectura mihi in mentem venit, ὁ κόσμος interpretationem esse alicujus, qui hanc vocem ad verba τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως explicandi causa appinxerit: τῆς ἀδικίας autem aliud glossema esse, vocem τῆς γέννης interpretantis. Nisi forte πῦρ τῆς ἀδικίας conjungere malis. Quicquid autem statuas, interpretationes certe quæ hujus loci vulgo afferuntur, nullo modo tolerari possunt.

2 Pet. i. 3, καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ.—Fluctuat lectio inter διὰ δόξης cum cod. Vat. et ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ cum cod. Alex. Hoc grammaticæ, illud sensui adversatur. Legendum, ni fallor, utraque lectione in unum conflata, δι’ ἰδίας δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς. Cf. Rom. xii. 1; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. x. 1.

1 Pet. i. 7, τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον, κ.τ.λ.—Requiritur participium post πολυτιμότερον. Suspicio ὄν propter ον præcedens excidisse. Simile erratum in Soph., *Æd. Tyr.*, v. 1315, ἀδάματόν τε καὶ δυσούριστόν, ubi addito ὄν dochmiacum explevit Hermannus.

2 Pet. i. 20, πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται.—ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται vix aliud significare potest quam vaticiniorum sacrorum sensum, non ex ipsis vaticinii verbis, verum ex eventu demum esse interpretandum. Hoc autem quum in omnia cujusvis generis vaticinia, nec solum in sacros scriptores, cadere apertum sit, non satis hoc apte diceretur. Sequentia autem si respicias, vides non de modo quo vaticinia sacra interpretari oporteat, verum de vaticiniis ipsis, unde ortum suum habuerint, ab Apostolo disputari. Legendum omnino ἐπελεύσεως, quæ vox rebus quæ divino afflatu efferuntur optime convenit. Luc. i. 35, πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σε. Act. i. 8, λήψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς. Hoc melius puto quam quod nonnullis placuit ἐπηλύσεως: nam simplex ἔλευσις occurrit Act. vii. 52, περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως

τοῦ δικαίου. Veram hujus loci interpretationem perspexit Grotius.

2 Joh. 1, ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ, κ.τ.λ.—Ambigitur utrum κυρία nomen sit proprium, an titulus quo fœminæ adultæ ætatis isto tempore compellari solebant. Est et alia interpretatio, cui favet Michaelis, sc. τὴν ἐκκλησίαν sub κυρίᾳ nomine latere: quod mihi quidem tam longe arcessitum videtur, ut confutatione non egeat: et miror interpretationem hujusmodi tanto viro placere potuisse. Κυρία autem vergentis, ut videtur, græcitatibus temporibus de iis quæ quatuordecim annos superavissent, usurpari solitum, ab Epicteto docemur: αἱ γυναῖκες εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τεσσερεσκαιδέκα ἐτῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν κυρίαι καλοῦνται. Enchirid., p. 726, ed. Upton. Verum titulus iste, ni fallor, in compellendo solum, sicut κύριε de viris, locum habebat. Nec multo magis mihi arridet eorum sententia qui κυρίαν nomen proprium esse, et de Cyria nescio qua locum hunc intelligendum esse arbitrantur. Nam quamvis e veteribus quibusdam inscriptionibus nomen illud fœminis interdum inditum fuisse appareat, rarius tamen illud, et vix ita frequentatum ut hujus loci interpretationi inserviat. Legendum arbitror ἐκλεκτῇ ἐν Κυρίῳ, et mox v. 5. καὶ νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε ἐν Κυρίῳ, quas conjecturas in notis commemoravit Griesbachius.

GULIELMUS LINWOOD.



THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON RITUALISM.

By THE REV. C. A. Row, M.A.

WE once read the Koran through. We have now performed the same office for the evidence adduced before Her Majesty's Commissioners of inquiry into the Ritualistic practices in the Church of England. The impression produced by the perusal of the Koran was that it was a pre-eminently dry book. Such a labour we should never advise a friend to undertake, if he were desirous of either amusement or edification. Still, however, it is not without points of interest. We must now express our opinion that the 'Evidence' is far more dry than the Koran, and far less edifying. In one point of view it produces on our mind a feeling of profound humiliation. Several of the Commissioners are unquestionably men of mark. Some of them are theologians of eminence. It is painful, therefore, to see that men of this description have been compelled to pass hour after hour in hearing discussions on the colour of a stole, or of a covering for a communion table, or on what the Archbishop of Canterbury was pleased to designate on one occasion as the "attitudes" of the officiating minister, while multitudes of hungry souls are fainting for the solution of the various difficulties involved in the great religious questions of the day. It is even more melancholy to discover that some of them seem to have felt themselves bound to devote considerable time to studies of this description.

But if it is a sign of the times that men of mental calibre should have been compelled to spend their time on such subjects, it is of still more serious import when we reflect that this report puts it beyond question that there are a large number of the clergy in whose eyes an "attitude," or the colour of a vestment, is a question of considerable importance in theology; perhaps one which they have more deeply studied than any other. Are the days going to return when questions as to the titheable character of mint, anise, and cummin are again to assume the rank of important ones in religious controversies? This evidence must surely bear a striking analogy to those foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law,

which St. Paul more than eighteen hundred years since pronounced unprofitable and vain.

But geologists have taught us that important sermons may be preached on stones. This evidence seems to us to consist of matter which in itself is as barren as the sand on the ocean shore. Still even a heap of sand may suggest some subjects on which it is highly important to meditate. We have implied that the evidence which is largely occupied with discussions about colours, "attitudes," and millinery, is supremely uninteresting. We ought in one point to qualify this opinion. Some of the reasonings on these subjects present us with many of the most amusing instances of logical fallacies which we have ever read, and we cordially recommend them to the attention of both the examiners and the examined at the next Oxford examination. The whole question is in fact the African fetish of the day. Fetishes are in themselves matters of the most supreme indifference; but they assume another aspect when men convert them from bundles of rags into objects of religious veneration.

In dealing with this report of the Commission, it is not our intention to discuss the relation of ceremonialism to Christian worship, or the degree in which outward forms are compatible with the preservation of the essential features of spiritual Christianity. We shall only lay down one or two great principles as distinctly defining our own views. We fully admit the great principle, that as long as man continues man, he will require the aid of the external to raise his mind to the contemplation of the heavenly and the spiritual. But we no less earnestly contend, that unless the external adjuncts of worship be kept within strict subordination to the spiritual element of our nature, the whole history of religion proves that the ceremonialism and the spirituality of religion will certainly change places, by the ceremonial assuming the chief importance in the eyes of the worshipper, and the spiritual element languishing and becoming gradually extinct. But the question before us is no longer one respecting the usefulness of external helps to assist in elevating the mind to heavenly things. It is no longer one of mere decency and order, or the degree in which the aid of music may be called in to the assistance of piety. The object

of the present movement is not only to call in external adjuncts to the aid of devotion, but to introduce a body of symbolism into the Christian Church as its chief instrument in religious teaching.

Now according to our own view this is the precise point where Christianity is distinguished from Judaism. Judaism was a religion of symbols. As such, it was suited to a low form of the human mind. It addressed itself to the eye and not to the understanding of the worshipper. As such, it involved a system of religious drill (*σωματικὴ ἀσκήσις*), which St. Paul says, "Profits little." It was only intended to be continued during the period of the infancy of the human mind. As such, the Gospel has pronounced its abolition as a system of religious teaching. Accordingly, St. Paul treats the whole Ritualism of Judaism as a system of weak and beggarly elements. Our Lord himself declares that, under this present dispensation, we are to be taught plainly of the Father. We are not only to worship Him in spirit, instead of worshipping Him by the outward formalism of the old religions, but in truth, as distinct from their symbolism. The attempt therefore to introduce a vast system of symbolical worship as a great teaching element in Christianity, is to forsake the Gospel, and to return to Judaism.

But the establishment of a system of symbolism as a great instrument of religious teaching is not the only end of the present Ritualistic movement. Its supporters no longer disguise the fact that they adopt it as a great vehicle for indoctrinating the English mind with the views and opinions prevalent at the period anterior to the Reformation, and for assimilating the Church of England to the practices and doctrines of the Church of Rome. Of this there is abundant evidence in the pages before us. To do some of the parties justice, they make no disguise about the matter. The Ritualistic party have distinctly avowed in "the Church and the world," which may without injustice be viewed as their manifesto, that they hope to effect, by the aid of an elaborate ritual, what they have failed to accomplish by argument, and that they now rely on it as the chief means of extending their principles and practices. This is strongly set forth in the article on the "Missionary aspect of

Ritualism." We are not prepared to say what temporary results might follow from sending out a body of missionaries among a heathen people, armed with all the appliances which modern art and civilization could put into their hands, for the purpose of working on the senses and the imagination. They might gather, as others have done before them, a large number of nominal converts. Similar feats have been already tried in the Christian Church, and the result has been the darkened Christianity of the middle ages. We regret to observe that even Dr. Hook, in his *Life of St. Austin*, has used language which implies that he considers that a large staff of choristers, crosses, and banners, would be an important adjunct in missionary enterprise. We apprehend that it is impossible to establish this position by any authority from the history of primitive Christianity. We are sure that our Lord did not try any appliances of this description in aid of his preaching, and the hopelessness of the effort to prove that the practice is apostolic, is strikingly shewn by the absurd attempt which has been made to prove that the cloak which St. Paul requested Timothy to bring with him was not intended to keep himself warm, but that it was actually a Eucharistic vestment. This is a bathos into which we scarcely thought it possible that even credulity could fall. But if such practices were attended with a temporary success in our missions, the only result which could follow from them would be, the importation of a mass of baptized heathenism into the Church, to be followed by centuries of shame to Christianity.

The idea of operating on the present aspect of society for the purpose of making converts to the religious principles of the Ritualists, through an elaborate system of externality and symbolism, is perhaps one not badly conceived. In the present state of our civilization there is an enormous mass of sentimental people too idle to think, but who cannot bear absolute vacuity. If the attempt were made to persuade them of the truth of the doctrines of the Ritualists, or in fact of any other doctrine, by fair reasoning and argument, it would probably prove a failure. But an elaborate ceremonial is a thing well suited to their taste. A thorough going system of Ritualistic worship, besides gratifying something of the religious sentiment, saves

them the trouble of going either to the theatre or the opera. The increase of wealth has caused a corresponding increase in the numbers of those who have little or nothing to do. The most inactive minds after a time, however, tire of being empty, swept, and garnished. Ritualism supplies the means of filling the vacuity. It gives something to talk about and something to do. The discussion of "attitudes," vestments, colours, in fact the whole paraphernalia of Ritualism, is a delightful species of small talk. As a substitute for talking scandal, if it were not for the religious aspect of the question, we should almost pronounce it an improvement. It also, as we have said, affords such people employment. Surely it is quite as well that hands which would otherwise be only employed in making antimacassars and worsted work, should be engaged in the manufacture of ecclesiastical millinery; and that those which would be otherwise employed in the adornment of their own persons, should be engaged in the decoration of Churches. A mind which does not like too much religion frequently objects to none, and such employments have the particular advantage of investing with a religious drapery this species of sentimentalism. Ritualism is on the whole well adapted even to those to whom thought is a labour. If it were not for the fact, that its supporters do not hesitate to avow ulterior designs of the deepest consequence, and to use the one as the means of attaining the other, it might be a question whether it would not be better to follow the advice of Gamaliel, and to let it alone, with the full assurance that, like all other follies, it will ultimately come to nought.

But the evidence adduced before the Commissioners brings before us two very serious aspects of Ritualism as working on the minds of the clergy. The one is its moral and the other its theological aspect. The moral aspect of Ritualism involves questions of the gravest import, and to these, as far as they are brought before us in this Report, we must draw the attention of our readers.

We have all heard of Tract No. 90, and the principles of moral teaching which it developed. We apprehend, from the evidence before us, that its principles form the morality of

Ritualistic minds. We are not at present called on to discuss whether the Church of England ought to be made more thoroughly and consistently comprehensive. We have already expressed in this Journal our distinct opinion that it is required alike by the interests of morality and religion. But it must not be supposed that an advocacy of a more enlarged comprehension, involves the admission that it is not essentially immoral to drive a coach and four through every portion of our existing formularies.

Such is the avowed object of the Ritualistic party. Notwithstanding that the Act of Uniformity distinctly declares that it was enacted for the purpose of enforcing uniformity of worship in the Church, and to the ordinary reader the Prayer-book presents the most unequivocal evidence that it was designed as a complete Church manual, the Ritualist lays down the following position as that which guides him in its interpretation. This principle is, whatever the Church does not formally forbid, it allows, if you can only find a suitable loophole for the introduction of a particular practice; *e.g.*, although in one place only in her formularies has she enjoined the sign of the cross, viz., at baptism, the Ritualist maintains that as the Church has not expressly forbidden it, he is entitled to make the sign of the cross whenever it suits his fancy; for this is what is practically meant when he thinks it is in conformity with Catholic usage. He applies the same principle to genuflections. The Church has nowhere commanded them in the Prayer-book. She has however enjoined the practice of bowing at the name of Jesus in the canons. Now these canons, whenever it is convenient to him, the Ritualist treats with the most profound contempt; as for instance, in the vestment question, where he takes refuge in an obscure rubric, and the authority of Parliament, of the interference of which in religious questions he has the most pious horror. This is his justification for disregarding their plainest enactments. But as the Church has not expressly forbidden the act of bowing or genuflection, he quietly introduces it whenever he thinks fit, in conformity with what he is pleased to call the usage of the Universal or the Western Church, of which he constitutes himself the sole judge.

But this is not the worst aspect of the question ; it is well known that there are several practices which existed in the earlier formularies of the Church which have been expunged out of our present Prayer-book. No formal condemnation is pronounced on them ; they are simply passed over in silence. The attention of several of the witnesses has been drawn to this fact, and their opinions distinctly elicited by the Commissioners. They have been asked whether they considered that they were justified in introducing practices into their ministrations which were authorized by Edward the Sixth's first Prayer-book, but which have been expunged from our present one. We think that the whole of the gentlemen examined have unanimously expressed their opinion that they feel themselves to be so justified. On being asked the grounds on which this justification is rested, some say that the omission may have been the result of an oversight ; but the majority declare that by thus simply expunging the practices in question, the Church has not forbidden them ; and if, according to their views, they are in conformity with Catholic practice, they are fully justified in re-introducing them.

We maintain that if the ministers of the Church propound a rule of moral obligation of this description, it is a matter in no ordinary degree serious. The principle laid down seems to us to amount to this, if applied to common life. We will suppose that a deed has been agreed to by certain parties, under which certain acts were lawful. It is agreed that another deed shall be substituted for it, which deliberately omits some provisions of the former deed. The first deed is superseded, and the last sanctioned in due form of law. Would any person pretend that the portions of the first deed thus deliberately omitted in the second, were not thereby rendered illegal. But such is the contention of the ritualists. We apprehend that if such a pretension was set up to their disadvantage, in any question of ordinary life, they would know how to deal with the persons making it.

We do not charge the Ritualists, or even the Tractarians, with being the first to introduce the principles of evasion into the interpretation of the formularies of the Church of England. Unfortunately these formularies have been so constructed as to

render this principle a necessity to every party in the Church on a minor scale. But Ritualism invokes their aid on a gigantic one. We are fully of opinion that the evasion of the ultra-Calvinistic party, which has attempted to reconcile the words of our communion service, which assert that Christ made a sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world, with the doctrine of particular redemption, by explaining the word "world" to mean the world of believers, as a single act of dishonesty, quite rivals any one single act which can be laid to the charge of the Tractarian or Ritualistic schools. But what this party have done in this particular instance, the latter party have applied as an instrument to explain away the formularies whenever it has suited their convenience to do so; and, what is still worse, they have applied it to introduce views which it was the object of the formularies to exclude. The plea that I interpret a formulary by Catholic consent, when rendered into simple English, means that I am desirous of evading its natural meaning.

Let it be observed, that we are not expressing an opinion as to what the Church of England ought to comprehend; but we are protesting against adopting principles of interpretation which the most thorough-going advocate would be ashamed to adduce in a court of justice. Whatever ministers of religion be not, let them avoid a Jesuitical casuistry.

But we must adduce a few examples from the evidence, that our readers may be distinctly aware of the nature of the principles against which we deem it our duty to utter an emphatic protest, as in our opinion morally *injurious*. The Rubric says, "Here followeth the Litany." Mr. Geyt is asked whether he thinks that this gives him authority to say it on Sunday afternoons, and to omit it at morning prayer; he answers, "The Prayer-book does not seem to prescribe that it shall follow immediately after, provided it is said after the morning prayer." *Ergo*, you may introduce the Communion Service first or read the Litany whenever it suits your convenience.

The reasoning by which various gentlemen justify the position of the officiating minister at the communion table is one of the most curious specimens of mental obliquity in reasoning with which we are acquainted. It is one of the highest desiderata for a

Ritualistic celebration that the officiating ministers should stand with their backs to the people and their faces to the table. There is an unfortunate rubric, however, which directs the priest, at any rate during a portion of the celebration, to stand on the north side of the table, and which leaves it very doubtful whether he must not continue in that position until the prayer of consecration. This direction is certainly the only place where his standing in front of the table is at all mentioned. But as the "attitude" of standing at the north would be very fatal to a due Ritualistic celebration, it must be got rid of at all hazards.

We were stupid enough to consider, as all communion tables are oblongs, that Euclid's definition was the correct one, and that he would certainly have defined a communion table as a four-sided figure, of which the opposite sides are parallel and the angles right angles. But it seems that the Ritualists have received a new revelation on that subject, and this in conformity with it, they have constructed a new definition, that a communion table is a figure which has only two sides and two ends. One of these they easily dispose of by turning it against the wall, and consequently we have nothing left to deal with but a single side. Euclid's aid, however, may be here convenient, and it can be invoked. Let, therefore, this side be bisected, and we shall get what we are in want of, a northern and a southern portion of it. Still, however, the stern Rubric directs the minister to stand on the north side of the table, and the whole side is situated due west. But it has a northern and a southern half, and therefore the persons who composed this Rubric may be cheated, and the priest enabled to stand in front of the table, notwithstanding its stern directions, by standing an inch (it may be) or two on the northern side of the bisection. We are not able to box the compass exactly, but by this legerdemain we think that the north side of the table becomes the west-north-west. One of our friends evidently answers a question as to where he stands during the act of consecration with great satisfaction, by saying, that in strict accordance with the Rubric he places himself at the centre of the table. The change may be unobserved by the congregation, as according to the above interpretation he requires only to move one or two inches.

The following correction of Mr. White by Mr. Perry, who, during his examination, stumbled into a mistake respecting the sides and ends of the communion table, will be amusing. In answer to the Earl of Harrowby, Mr. White had just stated that the white cloth on his communion table covered the top and the two sides. "But not the front," says the Earl. "Not the front" is the reply; hereupon Mr. Perry, one of the Commissioners, comes to the rescue. We quote the Report. "Rev. W. T. Perry: 'You mean by the sides, what would be commonly called the ends; you do not mean the front; it does not fall on the top of the altar?' 'It does not fall in front.' 'It lies on the top?' 'Yes.' 'On what would be commonly called the two ends?' 'Yes.' 'What is your position in celebrating the Holy Communion?' 'At what portion of the office?' 'At the beginning of the office where do you stand?' 'In front of the altar.' 'At which part?' 'To the north.' 'At the northern part of the front?' 'Yes.' 'Do you remain throughout in that position, or do you change your position?' 'If I am alone, and read the epistle, I move to the epistle side, and read the epistle from that side.' 'If you were assisted by others, for instance, if you had assistance in the gospel, which would you do then?' 'I should do what the rubric directs me to do.' 'Will you refer to that part of the rubric?' 'When the priest standing before the table hath so ordered the bread and wine.' 'You then go to the centre of the table before consecration?' 'Yes.' 'Do you consecrate in front?' 'Yes.'"

We really do not wish to be harsh, but we must say that this is the very spirit of a man who strains at a gnat and swallows a camel.

The Ritualists seldom read the first exhortation to the communion service. For this neglect, which is a plain breach of the Rubric, they find several excuses, which, when analyzed, ultimately resolve themselves into the consideration that it is convenient so to do. The announcement made by one or two of their evangelical brethren, that they administered to a whole rail at once, as a matter of convenience, in violation of the Rubric, seems to have excited the pious horror of some members of the Commission, although the episcopal body were reminded that the members of the bench were guilty of an

exactly similar breach of it in the act of confirmation. We believe that it has been very fashionable to cry out against the evangelical party as disregards of the order of the Church. We are satisfied that every impartial reader of the evidence before us will be of opinion that they are fully entitled to address to their opponents the words of our Lord, "First cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

We attach very little importance in itself to the use of pure wine, or wine mixed with water, in the communion, if it is not made the instrument of covertly introducing objectionable doctrinal views. We question whether the strongest sticklers for the use of pure wine can be sure of obtaining their object, after the recent accounts which we have seen of the various vinous adulterations, unless they import it direct from the vineyards, and even then it would be necessary narrowly to watch the process of manufacture. In fact, we suspect that wines of which a very small portion is the genuine juice of the grape are frequently used for the celebration, and that it is the rarest of all occurrences when the wine used is actually unmixed.

But while we think it a matter of the purest indifference whether the article used for the celebration of the communion be the wine of our ordinary shops, or receive a further dilution with water, yet the question assumes somewhat more of importance in our eyes when the latter is sought to be enforced as a matter of serious religious interest, and still more, when the subterfuges are resorted to, to effect the introduction of the practices which are openly avowed in this Report.

As far as the Church of England is concerned, the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. sanctioned the practice, but it has been quietly omitted in that which has legal ablegation. All the Ritualists concur in an unauthorized introduction to the practice.

We will again refer to Mr. White's evidence. That gentleman mixes water with the wine, but in answer to questions, he objects to have his practice designated as a deviation from the Rubric. He says, "I do not wish to imply that I regard it as a deviation from the Rubric." Being pressed again on this

point, he replies, "I should be sorry to do anything which I do not believe to be thoroughly and entirely justified by the Book of Common Prayer." He is then asked as follows: "It may be so, but where is there anything in the Book of Common Prayer as to the use of the water?" Mr. White replies, "I think that the usage of the Church in all times, the immemorial usage of the Church, is quite distinct on that head, and that water has been always used with the wine." Yet this gentleman objects that it should be imagined that he is guilty of a deviation from the Prayer-book. It is an addition, in fact, and not a deviation.

But we have in another part of this Report logic which is still more amazing.

Mr. Nugee, in his examination in answer to the question as to his use of the mixed chalice, states expressly that he considers it to be in conformity with the rubric of the Church of England. The examination proceeds: "The words are, 'and when there is a communion, the priest shall then place on the table as much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient.' 'Will you explain to the Commission how you understand that to permit the putting wine mingled with water instead of wine alone?' 'It is not forbidden.' 'Is there not another thing ordered to be put on, wine, not wine and water?' 'It does not say wine alone.'" The Reverend Commissioner Perry comes to the rescue of his friend. He reminds him of a fact which he seems to have forgotten, that in Edward the Sixth's first book the mixture of wine and water is once called wine after it is put on the table. He further reminds him that in our catechism the phrase occurs, "Bread and wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received." He then refers to the supposed Jewish practice of using a mixed cup at the passover, and tries to help his friend out of his difficulty by the following question: "If our Lord used the mixed cup, and the catechism speaks of the wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received, that might be a justification for the term wine applied to the mixed cup now?" Mr. Nugee is easily persuaded, and replies, "I do not know why it should not."

We must say that this hair-splitting is a most pitiful em-

ployment for reverend divines. Probably the wine merchants of these gentlemen will feel obliged for their explanations, and next time when they order wine for the purposes of the sacrament, they will send them that article well diluted with water, and reply that they have been guilty of no dishonesty, for wine for the sacrament was the article ordered, and such wine may be interpreted to mean wine and water. Perhaps they will try these gentlemen a little further, and when they order wine for their own use, they will deprive it of a little of its strength by a judicious application of the fountain.

Mr. Nugee, however, is a most sublime Ritualist, and we are afraid that he is beyond the reach of any earthly analogies. In conjunction with one or more writers in *The Church and the World*, his beau-ideal of Christian Ritualism is the symbolical worship of the Church in the Revelation. Here he thinks that he gets abundant scriptural authority for his practices, however deficient the formularies of the Church of England are in giving him such an authorization. He, however, has not explained, and the Commissioners have not asked him, how he intends to realize his model. We really wish to have a little information, how he proposes to supply in his church services the throne set in heaven around which the representatives of the Church assemble; what he is going to do to produce the lightnings, thunderings, and voices which issue therefrom, and whether he is going to introduce four living creatures of the form specified into his sublime services. We imagine it is in conformity with this supposed heavenly model, that the incense burnt during the singing of the Magnificat is "offered to the Diety." He is then asked "whether towards the sky?" and he replies, "It is raised up."

This gentleman is also a great observer of days, and months, and times, and years, although St. Paul thought that there was a danger of his having laboured in vain, if his converts took to the rigid observance of such things. He has a different mode of celebrating the sacrament, varying according to the character of the saint. In the midst of this discussion occurs the following question: "Then you would celebrate the communion differently on the fourth of July, on the translation of the remains of Martin,

bishop and martyr?" "Whenever a saint of the Church is concerned, it is regarded as a minor festival, and as such we regard it; though it may not be in honour of his sufferings, but of the translation of his remains. Whatever concerns the honour of the saint, in life or death." "Do you celebrate the Communion differently on the second of July, being the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin?" "As regards a white day, yes, as referring to the 'incarnation.'"

We must trouble this gentleman, once more, to favour us with a choice specimen of Jesuitical reasoning, and then dismiss him. He is one of the Ritualists who elevate the elements after consecration. He is asked to reconcile this with the twenty-eighth article. "I follow," says he, "the Church Catholic throughout the world. I go upon the general principle. If the Church of England disapproves of it, she has to say so. She has not as yet, as far as I know, in any way disapproved of it." "Of course you know the passage to which I refer," is the reply. The Sacrament of our Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance carried about, lifted up, or worshipped. Now let us hear the answer, "The emphasis there is on the words 'CHRIST'S ORDINANCE.' Of course we have not his direct injunctions on the subject."

We do not like to say hard things of any man; but this is really more than we can bear. We have not a very elevated opinion of the morality of the Stock Exchange; but we must tell Mr. Nugee that we are of opinion, that if he were to employ such evasions there, he would be in danger of expulsion.

We cannot avoid drawing the attention of our readers to the novel views promulgated on grammar by one of the Commissioners., Mr. Beresford Hope, during his examination of Mr. Webb. The Report does not inform us whether, during this portion of the examination, his brother Commissioners were able to retain their gravity. We hardly know whether, in our own mind, the disposition to laugh or to be indignant is the stronger.

The point in question is the meaning of the Rubric, which, for shortness, we will designate the vestment Rubric. Sir J.

Napier and this gentleman had just had a considerable debate as to the meaning of the word retained in the Rubric. To make the matter clear, we will cite the words of it. "And here it is to be noted, that such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI."

We will now hear Mr. Beresford Hope's lecture on the meaning of the future tense. "Mr. Beresford Hope:—'Sir J. Napier has called your attention to the words, 'shall be retained and be in use.' Has it ever struck you that the tense of the verb on which retained depends is the future, shall, indicating that retain does not point to antecedent use, but to that which is to be for the future?' 'That has crossed my mind, and I think that a great deal is to be said upon it.' 'Has it ever struck you, whether the introduction of the words 'shall be retained' is intended rather to strengthen than to diminish the force of the words 'be in use.' 'I think that is very probable.' 'That, in short, the Reformers of the Prayer-book in 1661 meant to make the ceremonial of the Church of England more ample than it was in the years between 1549 and 1662.' 'I feel convinced that that was their intention.'"

We trust that we do not misunderstand Mr. B. Hope; but we apprehend that he considers that the future tense when added to the verb retain destroys the natural reference of that verb to the past. "It does not point," he says, "to antecedent use, but to that which is to be for the future." The future tense of the verb is intended to destroy its natural reference to antecedent practice, and simply to assist in strengthening the next verb, Be in use, and that the whole indicates a deliberate purpose of the Reformers of the Prayer-book of 1661 to make the ceremonial of the Church of England more ample than it was between the years 1549 and 1652.

We do not know what views Cambridge men take of reasoning of this kind; but we are inclined to think that at Oxford it would endanger a candidate's degree, unless the Ritualistic element was strong on the heard of examiners, even although it

was sanctioned by the authority of one of Her Majesty's Commissioners.

The position which the Ritualistic party are now occupying about the right of private judgment, as testified by this evidence, is one of the most remarkable signs of the times, and proves that men in this present age are moving fast. We find them now asserting in the strongest manner the right of individual private judgment in various points connected with their system.

The principle which the Ritualist lays down respecting the use of vestments, colours, and, in fact, we may say the whole of his paraphernalia of worship, is founded on the most unlimited exercise of private judgment. According to his views the Prayer-book is no sufficient manual for his direction. In the darkness in which it leaves him, he must get direction where he best can. On being asked what is his express authority for the various practices which he introduces, he is able to appeal to no satisfactory one. One tells us to look to the use of the Church Catholic, but without telling us where its authoritative utterances are to be found. Another is inclined to rely on the Eastern Church, and another on certain old bronzes, inventories of vestments preserved in different churches and on pictures. Mr. Bennet tells us that the use of Sarum is the very ideal to which a Ritualist ought to use all his endeavours to work up to, and that he himself is in a fair way of realizing that ideal. Another Ritualist, we think that it is Mr. Geyt, tells us that the use of Sarum is very obscure, that he is very far from being satisfied what is its nature, and that he is obliged to cure its defects by appealing to the use of the Western Church. It transpires in the course of his examination that the use of the Western Church is a euphemism for that of the Church of Rome.

The net result of all this uncertainty is, that until the Church authoritatively decides on this subject, each individual priest is thrown on his own resources. No definite authority exists, and the zealous and obedient son of the Church is left to ascertain what is Catholic practice, or what the old bronzes say (for, alas, they give him but imperfect information about colours), or what was the use of Sarum, or even that of the Western Church, as he best can; in one word, he is left to the

unassisted exercise of his own private judgment. This right the Ritualists assure us that it is not their intention to allow to remain in abeyance; but that they intend to exert it in determining those points, subject to no other tribunal or authority than that of their own fancies. On a few trifles a bishop's voice may be heard; but whenever they are able to convince themselves of the high importance of any particular observance, they feel themselves entitled to set all authority at defiance. The whole of the evidence adduced on this subject strongly reminds us of a passage in the prophet Isaiah, "They make a god and worship it. They make a graven image, and bow down thereto."

Mr. Bennet's views on this subject are absolutely sublime. He is much questioned by the Commissioners as to what authority in the Church he is prepared to yield submission. Who is entitled to speak authoritatively on these doubtful points? Alas, there is no present authority in the Church which is entitled to abridge that gentleman's unlimited right of private judgment. Parliament, of course, with all good churchmen, he scorns. The bishop is good so far as he agrees with him; but not otherwise. He must determine everything subject to the consent of the Universal Church (*i.e.*, Mr. Bennet's own individual opinion of it), and has no right to say anything contrary to that. Nor can the Archbishop determine anything final. We must now quote this gentleman's evidence, lest our readers should think that we have misrepresented him. "To what would you appeal afterwards?" "To the Church." "What do you mean by an appeal to the Church?" "In synod assembled, in which the whole Church might speak, and not one individual." "In England would you consider the convocation to be that synod?" "No, it is not a synod; I should refer to the Catholic usage." "What is a synod?" "An aggregate body of the Church called together, and by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost deciding points. Convocation is not a sacred synod; it is a parliament." "Do you mean a synod in England?" "A synod in England, a national synod." "As distinct from convocation?" "Yes." "If a national synod came to a decision, you would be bound by that?" "Yes; I should feel myself bound by that."

This is certainly a most enviable position to find oneself in. It reserves to Mr. Bennet the right to exercise his own private judgment, or his own private vagaries, certainly for the full term of his natural life; and we suspect to all who are like-minded with him, for many generations after. No such national synod has existed in England for centuries. Mr. Bennet does not tell us how it is to be called; or of what it is to consist, except that it is to include the laity. Even if it were attempted to call such a council, until Mr. B. has expressly defined its nature, he would still be able to plead that it did not come up to the ideal of what it ought to be, to constitute it the organ of the Divine Spirit. Erasmus advised some of the controversialists of his day, when they stated their desire to put off the decision of the subjects of debate till the next general council, rather to put them off till the day of judgment. We are inclined to think that many of the points of controversy might have been judiciously deferred until that period. We confess that it appears to us that Mr. Bennet claims a right of private judgment for himself and friends which is likely for all practical purposes to be equally enduring.

We must praise Mr. Bennet for at least carrying his views out consistently. He pronounces the State and the Church to be naturally antagonistic; that the attempt to realize uniformity in all matters has been our destruction; and that the Act of Uniformity itself has been a cause of schism, "the cause of the whole of the misfortunes in our Church." If we remember rightly Dr. Arnold once expressed his opinion that this Act ought to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman. We think that he would somewhat modify that opinion now, as he little contemplated that its evasion would have been made the means of propagating a body of opinions which that straightforward and honest man utterly detested. Times strangely change. What was enacted to drive out Puritans seems to be our only protection against Romanizers.

It is painful to us to appear in any sense to controvert the right of private judgment. We have always esteemed it when properly understood to be the unalienable right of man. In our younger days the Tractarian movement proceeded on the prin-

ciple of denying it. We have often had many a controversy with gentlemen entertaining these opinions, and have endeavoured to maintain it against them. We now find ourselves in the unpleasant position in which Mr. Gladstone found himself last session of Parliament with respect to Reform. We are completely outbidden by our opponents.

Such a miraculous conversion might seem to be a subject for rejoicing. If we could believe it real, we would endeavour to do what St. Paul did before us, viz., to rejoice at our adversaries preaching our own opinions. But our satisfaction is deeply marred, because we cannot but view with suspicion this vindication of the extreme right of private judgment.

It is evident that no society can hold together on the principles maintained by Mr. Bennet. In matters of opinion the case is widely different; but in matters of practice, if every one has the right to adopt such practices as he pleases, then society must come to a speedy termination. If we were to apply the principles of some Ritualists to any ordinary club, it must end in its violent disruption. The Ritualist maintains that whatever is not expressly forbidden by the Church, he may introduce into its services, if it is in accordance with Catholic practice, which is always a euphemism for his own opinions about it; and that there is no authority which is competent to determine what is doubtful, or to restrain him in his practices. It is evident that this involves the complete subversion of every principle of law. We will suppose that we are invited to dinner with the request that we will appear in full dress. The invitation omits to say that it is to be the full dress of the English gentleman. What would be thought of our casuistry if we took advantage of this omission, and appeared in the full dress of the Irish labourer, or of the red Indian. Yet, if in matters of practice we assert the unlimited right of private judgment claimed by Mr. Bennet, it is evident that all the laws by which societies are held together must be subverted. The union with a society implies a voluntary suspension of the right as far as its laws are concerned, a submission to established usage and authority, and if any rule is doubtful, the acceptance of present practice as our guide. It is one thing for me to possess the right to determine whether vest-

ments are a necessary portion of Christian worship, but it is quite another to assert my right to obtrude my own private opinions on the society in which I minister, and to refuse to submit the question of the propriety of doing so to any existing or possible authority. If every man asserts the right of doing every thing which he pleases, churches and all voluntary associations are impossible.

It is quite a different question how far Ritualism ought to be tolerated in the Church. If the Ritualists wish it, let them plead for toleration. But it is absurd, instead of doing so, to assert an unlimited right of doing what they please whenever they can see a place for an evasion. It seems to us to involve the gravest suspicion, when men whose minds are thoroughly imbued with Sacerdotal, Tractarian, and Ritualistic tendencies, plead for a right of private judgment, which goes far in advance of everything which has ever been claimed by its most consistent advocates. When the party in opposition suddenly desert all their former principles, and become the most extreme advocates of those which they have formerly vehemently denounced, we may be pardoned for doubting the thoroughness of their conversion. We believe that Ritualism involves the great principle of Sacerdotalism, and that this latter, if it triumphs, is as certain to extinguish the exercise of all free thought as water is to extinguish fire.

Taking therefore a calm view of this portion of the evidence before us, it produces the conviction that the principles of the movement are fundamentally wrong, and contrary to the moral sense of society. They are only maintainable by the aid of a highly Jesuitical casuistry. A man who interprets obligation by the principles which this evidence shews that the Ritualists avow that they apply to the Church formularies, is in a fair way of extinguishing in his mind all sense of the noble and the true. Applied to the contracts of ordinary life such principles are properly designated cheating; and if assumed as the morality of the commercial world, they would certainly produce a feeling of distrust far greater than that through which this country has recently passed. Nothing more strongly arouses our feelings of indignation than the advocacy of such principles by religious men. But

the Ritualists will reply, We did not begin these practices. We found them in existence in the Church, and we have only carried them completely out. The necessities of every party in the Church have compelled them to adopt some system of evasion to escape from the natural meaning of some portion of the Church formularies. Why are we to be denounced for doing what others have done before us? We admit that the answer is not without force, and we strongly advocate on behalf of the interests of morality the removal of those stumbling blocks which the vehemence of party feeling has introduced into, or retained, in the formularies of the Church of England. None are more anxious than ourselves that she should be made as thoroughly comprehensive as is consistent with her discharging the *functions of a Church*. But we reply that it is a very different thing to employ an evasive interpretation to explain away the force of some passage in our formularies which may be objectionable to a particular line of thought, while we cordially agree with their general force and scope, and to employ the same principle in introducing what we can only designate a new system.

It is a strange plea for a religious man to offer that, because others have practised evasions on a small scale, that he is entitled to practise them on a great one. We think that to an honest mind the position of things is sufficiently plain. Prior to the Ritualistic innovations the practice of the Church of England has presented a general uniformity for a period of three hundred years. We maintain, whatever may be the obscurities of documents, that the practice of three centuries ought to be invested with all the sanctity of law. The great bulk of the laws of England are not the result of formal enactment, but of general practice. So strong have been the feelings of the people of England on this subject, that only once during this interval has there been a serious effort made to introduce into our services anything of a kindred character to Ritualism, and that in a very modified form compared with the present movement. This attempt ended in the temporary overthrow of the Church. The Ritualists ask us to believe that at its restoration an attempt was made covertly to introduce a more splendid ceremonial into the services of the Church, which if it had been openly avowed

and openly acted on in the manner in which the Ritualists now act on it, would unquestionably have sent Charles II. a second time on his travels. But whatever these persons whom Mr. Beresford Hope calls the Reformers of 1661 meant by the Rubric which they have introduced, it is evident that they did not themselves venture to restore celebrations such as those of our modern Ritualists, or even to hint that they hoped for their restoration in more favourable times. If they had entertained any such designs, it is evident that they only ventured to proceed *sub rosa*. We do not believe that such was their intention; and if it was, it is against such proceedings on the part of religious men, that we feel it a duty emphatically to protest. The plain words must be uttered,—they are violations of moral principle. But whatever might have been the intention of the so-called Reformers of 1661, the un-Ritualistic practice of the Church of England has since received the sanction of nearly two centuries. When the second centenary period was nearly completed, a certain number of subtle spirits conceived the idea of polishing a rusty sword, and making an attempt to assassinate with it the practice of three centuries.

Now while we admit that parties have existed in the Church who have been compelled to explain away the natural meaning of some portion of her formularies, and even that no party has existed which has not found it necessary to exert a liberty of this description, yet we contend that such things bear no comparison whatever to the present Ritualistic movement. We do not think that the appeal to the letter of the law is well founded. The Ritualists themselves are forced to confess that it is a very doubtful one. But viewing it in the most favourable aspect, it is an appeal to the letter against the spirit of legislation, and we will recommend to all such that do so the careful consideration of the words of one whose authority they will not dispute, “The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.”

This aspect of Ritualism, as it is distinctly brought to light by the evidence before us, we think to be particularly alarming, and we hope that we do not speak too strongly when we designate it as sapping all elevated moral principle. But the evidence before us presents us with even a much worse aspect of this

phenomenon. Ritualism appeals to the letter, and then tries to stretch it, until it cracks, by a body of subtle and casuistic interpretations. If a man appeals to the letter, let him uniformly and consistently follow it; but to appeal to the letter of the word when convenient, and to violate it when it suits our purposes, is a practice which we hardly know how to designate. Nothing has more damaged religion than the frequent adoption by religious men of practices which on any sound system of morals must be deemed to be evasions.

Our limits will only allow us to give a brief glance at that portion of the Report which brings before us the peculiar religious aspect of Ritualism. The services of the Ritualists are not professed to be elaborated on purely æsthetic principles. An elaborate ritual thus constructed need not of necessity have any doctrinal reference. It might embody its inventor's conception of a system of external forms best suited to act on man's composite nature of mind and body, and to elevate it to heavenly things. Such a system would stand or fall on its own merits. The only question which would require to be determined would be, how far it would be suited to attain its purposes, and it would be worthy of acceptance or rejection according as it was fitted for their attainment. But the Ritualist, while he seeks this, professes to pursue another object which in his eyes is even of higher importance, the introduction of a body of Ritualism which shall be symbolical of doctrine. The Ritualist's object is to use external symbolism, aided by an elaborate ritual as the great instrument of religious teaching. He would indoctrinate men with religious opinions through the medium of the senses rather than the understanding. In one word, he would subvert the prophetic office in the Church, or reduce it within the narrowest dimensions. His plain object is to substitute the priest for the prophet. In fact, the priest of Judaism will not content him. He puts in claims to a priestly power at which the Jewish priest would have stood aghast. He claims right to perform acts and functions which he would have viewed as an assumption on his part little short of blasphemous. He not only can forgive sins, but offer an actually present divine and human Christ to the Father.

To do the Ritualists who have given their evidence before the Commissioners justice, they make no concealment of their purposes and objects. They make their Ritualism a system of symbolism. That symbolism presents doctrine to the eye of sense. The doctrines in question approximate to those of the Church of Rome, and are separated from them only by the nicest distinctions which even some of the Ritualists themselves concede they are unable to attain a clear conception of. On this point the statements of Mr. Bennet are clear and distinct, and preclude all possibility of doubt as to what are his intentions. He says that in contending for Ritualistic observances, "He is not contending for any external thing, but for the doctrines which are hidden under them." He distinctly states, "The vestments are used with a specific respect to the divine person of the Son of God, to advance his glory, to set forth his real presence, and to vivify his sacrifice on the cross." He again openly avers that his purpose in introducing the vestments is not æsthetic, but doctrinal; and that their æsthetic character is a pure accident. He then declares that his views of doctrine as expressed by them may be correctly summed up in the following words, "The real objective presence of our blessed Lord, the sacrifice offered by the priest, and the adoration due to the presence of our blessed Lord."

But another of Mr. Bennet's statements is of so clear and conclusive a character that we must draw the attention of our readers to it. Mr. Bennet has published a series of Essays, in one of which occurs the following passage, which is read to him, and he is asked if he wishes to modify its statements. "The ancient vestments present to crowds of worshippers the fact that here before God's altar is something far higher, far more awful, more mysterious than aught that man can speak of, viz., the presence of the Son of God in human flesh subsisting. Would you wish to retain that?" "Decidedly," is the reply. "You mention what incense represents on the next page. I will read it, and take the liberty of asking whether you wish to maintain that? 'The incense is the mediation of Jesus ascending from the altar to plead for the sins of men.'" "I do not mean that the incense pleads, but that the intercession repre-

sented by the incense pleads." Mr. Bennet is subsequently questioned on this subject by Mr. Beresford Hope. Question, "Therefore you would not adopt that which you thought symbolized any doctrine which you thought the Church of England repudiated?" "No, decidedly not." . . . "If, for instance, the doctrine of Transubstantiation?" "I cannot answer that. What transubstantiation means, I never could understand." "Should you think it an unintelligible doctrine?" "I think it an unintelligible doctrine." "You think the doctrine of the Sacrament in the Church of England is an intelligible one?" "Decidedly." "Therefore you do not hold with transubstantiation?" "No."

We really are not surprised at Mr. Bennet's difficulty in understanding the meaning of the doctrine of transubstantiation, if he thinks that it denotes anything very distinct from what he considers as the doctrine of the Church of England, and which he tells us that he very clearly understands; that in the consecrated elements is "the presence of the Son of God in human flesh subsisting; and that there is a mediation of Christ ascending from the altar to plead for the sins of men." We agree with Mr. Bennet that the doctrine of transubstantiation or of consubstantiation is one which no human being can make the subject of direct intellectual comprehension, because it involves a contradiction; but we firmly believe that when Mr. Bennet asserts that he can comprehend his own doctrine, he is under an utter delusion, and that it is only separated from the one which he pronounces himself unable to comprehend, by a few metaphysical hair-splittings. The one is as comprehensible as the other, and if incomprehensibility is a ground for rejecting the one (in which opinion we cordially agree with Mr. B.), it is a ground for rejecting both. We should certainly think it not worth while to be burnt for the difference between them, and that if the doctrines held by the Reformers were the same as those held by Mr. B., they were very foolish for their pains.

The Ritualists seem nearly unanimous in holding the sacrificial character of the Holy Communion, and an actual bodily presence of Christ, either in the elements or on the table. Mr. Bennet asserts *totidem verbis* that he considers himself a sacri-

ficing priest. In fact, this is the only truth which gives consistency to their mode of celebration. It of course follows, as a necessary consequence, that an act of adoration is due to the divine presence on the altar, and we think that if the framers of the articles held these views, they were guilty of a cruel inconsistency, in forbidding either their elevation or their adoration. This the Ritualists must excuse us for saying is plainly and obviously the only honest meaning of the article, and that their attempt to escape from it is a Jesuitical evasion of the worst type.

As to many of the meanings which ought to be attached to the different species of symbolism, they are far from being agreed. Some of them seem to have most extraordinary powers of digestion. When people are very hungry nothing comes amiss. We think that Mr. Geyt's appetite for symbolism must be so intense that he must be, at all times, ready to swallow whatever is offered to him. The subject of discussion is the "Amice," and its symbolical use. "The symbolism," says this gentleman, "is various. Some old writers suppose it to have been symbolical of the crown of thorns; it used to be placed first on the head, and then, as now, to be worn round the neck." "It is a small piece of linen?" "Yes." "Should you think it would be right to say that it was in memory of the rag of linen with which the Jews blindfolded our blessed Lord?" "That is one of the old symbolical meanings put forth. There are several." "And of the napkin which the angels folded up on the tomb?" "Yes, that is another." Probably the larger the number of symbolical meanings which can be attached to a piece of cloth the better; anything will do, provided it withdraws the mind from the direct contemplation of truth, and keeps it in a weak and infantine state. But we cannot spend more time over such absurdities. All we can do is to protest against such a mode of teaching religious truth, which instead of elevating weak minds from their weakness, is likely to degrade them into a positive condition of spiritual idiotcy.

If we were able to believe that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews held the opinions about the priesthood of the Christian ministry which the Ritualists have distinctly avowed

in the course of their examination, and that in the sacrament a sacrifice was offered of the character described by them, we could come to only one conclusion, that the writer of that epistle was a dishonest man.

Our Ritualistic friends are no less candid in acknowledging their views about confession, and that the office of probing the conscience and of forgiving sins is an unalienable prerogative of the Christian priesthood. Mr. Wagner distinctly admits that he is in the habit of imposing penances. "Whenever," says he, "a person makes a confession, of course there is always some penance enjoined, it may be saying a prayer. It usually would be saying one or two prayers. It would be one's duty to impose some penance or other." Mr. Beresford Hope: "Do you impose any penance involving corporal pain?" "It is not, perhaps, a question one ought to speak about. I have never myself imposed any such penance, but I cannot say so as to others." We think that Mr. Wagner's silence is as worthy of commendation as the wisdom of the unjust steward. Mr. Clay makes several startling disclosures in connection with the confessional, as it is practised at Mr. Wagner's church. The truth of these Mr. Wagner denies on his own behalf and that of his curates, although he admits the possibility of having forgotten amidst the number of persons who seek spiritual advice of him. Mr. Clay again solemnly reiterates the truth of his whole statement. We do not think it necessary to go further into this subject, as it appears in the evidence, because we believe that it may be safely left in the hands of the people of England, who will never suffer matters which pass in the interior of their families to be in danger of being laid open to the curiosity of a prying priest.

We shall only express our opinion, for the sake of the priest himself. The influence which the hearing of confessions must exert on his mind must be necessarily an immoral influence. It forces him to live in an atmosphere of spiritual malaria.

If the Ritualists are successful in their doctrinal efforts, the system will result in the establishment of a priesthood which will obtrude itself between the worshipper and his God, and by means of its sacrificial and penitential systems, will seize the

power of the keys, and usurp the right of opening and shutting the kingdom of heaven.

Such then in brief are the doctrinal tendencies of Ritualism, and we owe our thanks to the gentlemen who were examined for the candour with which they have avowed them. It certainly will not be their fault if, in future, their aims and purposes are misunderstood. We will briefly sum up what they are.

1st. It is the object of the system to convert the Christian ministry into a sacerdotal order, and to subordinate every other characteristic of it to that as its leading idea.

2nd. To concentrate the whole of worship around the celebration of the Holy Communion, in which an actual sacrifice is offered, and in which our Lord's divine and human person is so rendered present by the act of consecration, that adoration is due as to a present Christ.

3rd. To introduce into the Church of England the system of the confessional.

4th. To introduce into the act of worship an elaborate symbolic ritual, whereby the whole body of so-called Catholic doctrine, which is usually held in connection with these leading principles, may be presented to the mind of the worshipper as the admitted doctrine of the Church.

On one point of doctrine the Commissioners have made few attempts to elicit the views of the Ritualists, viz., their opinions as to the reverence and honour due to saints and the Virgin. We regret this, as considering their candid avowals on other points, it seems not likely that they could have withheld from the public their opinions on this question. That defect, however, we can supply, for being a few months since present in a Ritualistic church of high standing (we allude to St. Peter's, Plymouth), during the catechising of the younger members of the congregation, the minister distinctly stated that the Virgin was worthy of the highest reverence, short of the supreme adoration which was due to God, and that he would assert that such was the teaching of the Church in the presence of any bishop on the bench.

Such being the doctrines, tendencies, and practices of Ritualism, the question at once arises, what is the course which ought to be taken respecting it. Now that the whole nature

and character of the movement is fully disclosed, it will be impossible to avoid taking some positive course respecting it. At any rate, ignorance can no longer be pleaded as a reason for inaction.

The Commissioners have arrived at the following decision. "We are of opinion that it is expedient to restrain, in the united Church of England and Ireland, all variations in respect of vesture from that which has long been the established usage of the said united Church, and we think that this may be best secured by providing aggrieved parishioners with an easy and effectual process for complaint and redress."

They then tell us that they are not yet prepared to recommend to Her Majesty the best mode of giving effect to these conclusions, but that they propose doing so in a subsequent report.

Until they have done so, we, in like manner, may be excused from discussing any particular plan. We shall, therefore, conclude with a few general observations.

We admit that the whole question is one which is encompassed with no inconsiderable difficulty. The use of the vestments the Commissioners have determined that it is expedient to restrain, and that the long established usage is to be the only correct model for the dress of the officiating ministers for the future. We cannot conceal from ourselves that, although this may be throwing a sop to the Cerberus of public opinion, if they really propose to stop the progress of the movement, they would have to grapple with many other and very serious questions. The suppression of the vestments will deprive the Ritualists of one important means, whereby the progress of their opinions has been facilitated, but after the distinct avowals of doctrine and practice which we have been considering, it is a delusion to expect that the party will not be prepared to adopt other means for carrying out their purposes. The question of what is the amount of ceremonial in religious worship which may be allowed consistently with maintaining the predominance of the spiritual element in religion, is one which must ultimately force itself on the attention of the Commissioners.

One thing seems to us to be obvious. The liberty which the minister of the Church of England at present enjoys of making alterations in the established usage of the services, and the mode of conducting them, ought to be taken away. It is true that he is restrained within certain limits; but within these limits, which are very wide, he is to all intents and purposes an autocrat. The difference between a read and a chanted service is very great; but whether it shall be the one or the other depends on his own will and pleasure. The power which the clergyman at present has, of introducing alterations into the services without consulting either the wishes of the congregation or the authority of the bishop, is contrary to every idea of good government. It is, in fact, a tyranny.

In country parishes the existence of this power is an unmitigated hardship. It may be said that, in towns, if a person does not like the mode of celebrating the worship in any particular church, he can go to another more to his liking at no great distance. This is unquestionably for the most part true; but let it be observed, that it is utterly subversive of the theory of our parochial system. Perhaps, however, that it is among the things of the past. Still we must contend that it is absurd to concede to the judgment or the caprices of one man the power of driving a whole congregation to the doors, if he be so minded. But in country places the layman has frequently no remedy. He must either attend a service which is to him utterly unedifying, perhaps positively offensive, or abstain from going to Church altogether.

We are far from wishing to determine whether a chanted or a read service is most edifying, or to assign the precise limits within which music ought to be employed as an adjunct to worship. The point which we are urging rests wholly on independent grounds. Congregations have a right to protection against innovations introduced in accordance with the mere private will of individual clergymen, without any reference to their wishes, and it may be, in actual defiance of them. In the same manner we think that measures ought to be taken to prevent a majority from tyrannizing over a minority in cases where there is a difference of opinion on this subject, by supplying each with a service

at some period of the day, whenever it is possible, in conformity with their respective tastes.

But the question cannot help forcing itself on the attention of all thoughtful persons, Is a system such as Ritualism to be tolerated in the Church of England? and if so, subject to what limits and conditions?

We have already expressed our opinion in favour of granting to all classes of opinions as wide a toleration in the Church of England as is consistent with her continuing to exercise the functions and the character of a Church. Our readers, however, will see that the discussion of this subject could only be satisfactorily handled in a separate article. For the present, therefore, we must content ourselves with observing, that if any plan can be devised for the comprehension, within certain well defined limits, of a system of worship involving a more elaborate ceremonial than that which has been common among us, (and we wish to express no opinion as to its possibility or desirableness,) it would involve the necessity of a corresponding expansion of the system in the opposite direction. A comprehension which can be made to embrace such a system as even a moderate infusion of the Ritualistic element, carefully guarded from the danger of abuse, ought in common justice to be expanded so as to embrace some portion of the elements of dissent, as far as they are not incompatible with the maintenance of a national Church. If concession is made in one direction it must be made in the other. We are by no means asserting its possibility in either case, although we are fully prepared to advise a wise expansion of the comprehensiveness of the Church.

But the moral aspect of the question is a very serious one, and we hope that this will commend itself to the attention of the Commissioners. We have already expressed our deep conviction that the present aspect of things is very unsatisfactory. A great breadth of religious thought was doubtless intended to be comprehended in the Church of England; but it has been effected in a manner extremely inartificial. Those who have accomplished it have been afraid openly to carry out their purpose. The theory is narrow—the practice wide. No care has been taken to remove stumbling-blocks out of the way of per-

sons holding those opinions, which it is even her intention to comprehend. To whatever extent comprehension is to be carried in future, let the purpose and the intention be openly and distinctly avowed. At present the various parties in the Church are obliged to swallow many things of hard digestion, and to get rid of them as they best can. This has introduced a mode of explaining and interpreting formularies which we cannot consider to be consistent with nobleness or straightforwardness, and which nothing but the necessities of the case would have induced men to submit to. While this was practised on a small scale, it has attracted comparatively little attention. John Bull is a being who can never be induced to take account of small matters, or small grievances. They must pinch his own toes, and grow as big as a mountain, before he thinks them worthy of his attention. The evidence adduced before this Commission shews that the evil is rapidly attaining the dimensions we have spoken of. The Ritualistic mode of interpreting the formularies is only maintainable by the aid of a system of casuistry of a very dangerous character. It is only bearable by its being at present confined within the regions of religion. It would be unendurable if it became the acknowledged principle which regulated the ordinary dealings between man and man. We, therefore, earnestly call on the Commissioners, whatever principle of comprehension they may recommend for the maintenance of the peace and the national character of the Church, to accompany it with such recommendations as will remove out of the way of religious men the temptation to use evasive principles of interpretation with respect to the formularies, which under the violence of religious partizanship, are sure ultimately to create the moral phenomena which are so strikingly brought before us in the Report of the Commission.

JOHANNES HUS REDIVIVUS.

No. II.

IN the last number of *The Journal of Sacred Literature* I gave a brief account of the publication of the works of John Huss in the Bohemian language, with a specimen of his popular sermons. I now proceed to give a more detailed account of one of his popular theological works, his *Exposition of the Creed*, also in the Bohemian language, and now printed for the first time. In selecting passages for quotation, I shall proceed upon the principle of taking those that bear especially upon matters of interest at the present day, whether they coincide with or run counter to generally-received opinions, and also any passages that may be striking for their beauty of language or elevation of sentiment, neglecting the ordinary orthodox explanations of doctrine, which are found in every respectable expositor.

The whole work, of which the Exposition of the Creed is a portion, is contained in 386 octavo pages, of which pp. 1—52 contain the longer and shorter expositions of the Creed, pp. 52—288 longer and shorter expositions of the Ten Commandments, pp. 288—358 longer and shorter expositions of the Lord's Prayer, and pp. 358—386 a Directory to the Exposition (*Zpravidlo k vykladu*), consisting of various pieces of information and an Index. I shall for the present confine my attention to the Expositions of the Creed, which occupy the first twenty-eight chapters of the work.

Huss introduces his work and gives his reasons for writing it as follows: "Every Christian who possesses understanding, if he wishes to be saved, must believe, must fulfil God's commandments, and must pray to God. With respect to the first, the Saviour says, 'He that believeth will be saved, and he that believeth not will be damned.' (Mark xvi. 16). With respect to the second, he saith, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments' (Matt. xix. 17). With respect to the third, he saith, 'Men ought to pray' (Luke xviii. 1). Since these three things are so necessary to a man for eternal life, it is good that he should become acquainted with them, that, being acquainted with them, he should understand them, and that, understanding

them, he should fulfil them in practice. And since without faith it is impossible to please God, (Heb. xi. 6), St. Paul saith, 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation;' and a man cannot believe God, or in God, unless he hearkens to him, and how shall he hearken to him unless some one instructs him?

"Because I am a priest, sent by God in the hope that I should teach the people to believe, to fulfil the commandments of God, and to pray to God aright, I wish briefly to expound these three things to simple people. And since to a person desiring to draw near to God faith is the first thing necessary, as a first foundation in God, the second the keeping of the commandments, and the third proper prayer, therefore I desire first to make known the Great King in the creed to his courtier, secondly his commandments, and then prayer, that, knowing his Lord and keeping his commandments, he may with propriety venture to beseech his Lord, and He be pleased to hearken to him. Therefore, thou who desirest to serve in the court of the Greatest of Kings, the Lord God, oughtest thus to know him with the heart, that is, to believe, and with the mouth, if it be necessary, confess him before men unto death."

Then follows the Apostles' Creed, which is ascribed, according to the legend, to the twelve apostles, each contributing an article, although learned men, says Huss, are by no means agreed as to the exact article contributed by each apostle. The following is a striking passage on the foundation of faith (*zalozenie viery*).

"Likewise also all Christians ought to believe what God hath commanded to be believed; although every man does not know all that ought to be believed, yet he is ready and ought to be ready, when the truth is shewn to him out of the Holy Scriptures, to receive it gladly, and should he hold anything contrary to the Scripture, to forsake it immediately. And it is good for every man not to hold anything curiously, but, when he comes to know God's truth, to hold it firmly even unto death, for the truth will eventually make him free, for the Lord Jesus saith, 'If ye continue in my word, then will ye be my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free'

(John viii. 31, 32). Therefore, faithful Christian, seek the truth, hearken to the truth, learn the truth, hold the truth, defend the truth even unto death; for the truth will make thee free from sin, from the devil, from the death of the soul, and finally from everlasting death, which is everlasting separation from the favour of God and from all the joy of salvation, which joy he will obtain, whoso believeth in God and in Jesus Christ, who is very God and very Man" (kap. v).

Huss gives his sentiments on the subject of the real presence in kap. ix., "From these testimonies thou hast, that the priests talk foolishly and erroneously when they say, 'We can, when we will, create God or the body of God.' As if they were creators of their Creator, and that when, all together, they cannot create a single fly! And thus speaking they howl like wolves, desiring to exalt themselves above the laity and extend the sphere of their avarice. And in token thereof they preach with respect to the new masses, that the priest is more worthy than the Mother of God, and that he creates the body of God, and they prove it thus: 'The Mother of God bore him once, but the priest creates him often and when he pleases:' and thus by one error they prove another. But the humble priest does not exalt himself above the Virgin Mary, or say, that he is the creator of Christ, the son of God, but that the Lord Christ by his power and his word through him causes that which is bread to be his body; not that at that time it began to be his, but that there on the altar there begins to be sacramentally (*posvátnie*), in the form of the bread, what previously was not there and therein."

Several matters in the explanation of the "Descent into hell" are not in accordance with the Protestant theory. In kap. xiii. John Huss says, "There were four hells before the descent of Christ, one that of the damned, who have sinned actually; and in that is darkness, so that neither is God seen, nor is grace possessed, and there are sensible torments; and this is called the deepest hell, that is to say, the torments in it are the most horrible. The second hell is one in which there is darkness, so that neither is God seen, nor is the grace of God possessed, but there are no sensible torments in it; and this is

the place of unbaptized children and of the uncircumcised under the old law. The third hell is one in which there is darkness, so that God is not seen, but not so that grace is not possessed, and this is called Purgatory (*ocistec*); in this the souls of those saints who die without making satisfaction for their sins, suffer, and it is called 'purgatory,' because the soul which has been spotted with sin has there to be purged from guilt by suffering. The fourth hell is that in which there is darkness, so that God is not seen, but not so that the grace of God is not possessed, and in which there were no sensible torments, and this hell was called *limbus*, that is, the prison of the holy fathers. And in that it is said, 'He descended into hell,' other saints understand, though they do not positively affirm, that he took many out of purgatory, whether because they had already suffered sufficiently, or because he made satisfaction for them from grace; therefore they do not affirm positively, whether he led all out of the third hell, or only those who had suffered sufficiently up to the time of the descent of Christ. With regard to this, I will neither affirm positively nor speak curiously, but commit it to the divine secrecy, believing that he descended into hell and delivered the saints, and that he has still ordained everlasting hell for the damned, and also that those who do not repent sufficiently here are to be purified for salvation as it were by fire, and that they are thus being purified. And how they can be aided, and what can aid them most, will be written hereafter in other books, if the Lord God grant me to live long enough."

Huss gives his sentiments on the subject of "personal assurance" in very plain language in kap. xvi. "And a third thing he has also concealed from us, which is the knowledge of perdition or salvation; for none of us knows whether he will be saved or lost, independently of special revelation; as also none of us knows whether he is in the grace of God or in mortal sin. And that for this reason, that, always dreading separation from everlasting life, and fearing everlasting perdition, we may very zealously guard ourselves from sin."

Huss's illustration of his idea of the communion of saints, in kap. xix., is worth transcribing. "The eleventh article, viz., this, 'The communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins,' was

added by Saint Jude. Know that the communion of saints is the enjoyment of the merits of all the saints, so that all saints enjoy first of all the merits of Christ, then those of the holy church, and then each saint enjoys those of each saint, so that what has been merited by Christ as man, and by the whole congregation of the saints, is enjoyed by each saint, and this is called holding communion, that is to say, enjoying good all together. As, when any village possesses pastures, these pastures are called the common, because each of the community is entitled to enjoy these pastures regularly without hindrance, and thus all the saints have the sufferings of Christ, as beautiful pastures, in common, on which the saints in heaven, here, and in purgatory, feed. Likewise, if any faithful man recites the Lord's Prayer, or does any good work whatever, all the saints have it in common; for the saints in heaven have enjoyment therein, the saints here have aid therefrom, to enable them to stand more vigorously against the devil, and the saints in purgatory have aid towards being sooner liberated. Therefore every man ought to be diligent to be without mortal sins; for thus, if he be elected, he will participate in all the good that is done in the whole world. And this was what the prophet David prayed for;^a 'Make me a partaker of all them that fear thee and keep they commandments.' Whoso considers this communion will be diligent in faith, hope, and love, and will not trust in purchase of masses, prayers, or indulgencies, being an evil liver. For mortal sin kills in a man participation in this holy communion, for it severs from that holy community, so that he is excommunicated from all that is good, and is at that time under the curse of God; for David, the prophet, says, 'Cursed are they that err from thy commandments.'^b

The first mention of the great Englishman, Wycliffe, of whom Huss was a disciple, occurs in kap. xx. in considering the question of the power of the keys. After narrating the raising of Lazarus, Huss proceeds: "In this fact thou hast, that God the Father and Christ and Christ's call restored Lazarus to life, and the disciples looked on in readiness, and then, at the word of command, loosed him, when living. So is it in the remission

^a Apparently Psalm cxix. 63.

^b Apparently Psalm cxix. 21.

of mortal sins, when a dead soul is to revive: God himself cleanses it by his power from internal stain, remits its sin, and unbinds it from the debt of everlasting death through Christ's merits; but the priest cannot do this, that is to say, cannot thus cleanse and revive the soul, but he has power to loose and to bind, that is, to declare people bound and loosed. Therefore Christ first revived Lazarus, and they afterwards loosed him, that he might see and walk freely; and also he first healed the lepers himself, and afterwards sent them to the priest, that they (the priests) might give testimony to Christ, that he healed them (the lepers), and might also declare to them, that they could with safety dwell publicly in the congregation. And thus thou hast, that it is impossible for the priest to remit the sins of any one, unless they are first remitted by God, and Christ, the Grand Priest, and his merits. Therefore saith the MASTER OF DEEP THOUGHTS, that God does not follow the judgment of the priest, who often judges treacherously and ignorantly, but God always judges according to truth."

After completing the discussion of the Apostles' Creed at length, Huss gives his shorter exposition, and then a translation of the Nicene Creed, upon which he comments somewhat briefly. His sentiments on the subject of baptism in kap. xxviii. will not be without interest. "Farther saith the Creed, 'I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins;' so that, as there is one Lord, in whom we believe, and one faith, there is likewise one baptism and one God; and this baptism is for the remission of sins, so that it takes away all sins, from children and aged persons, if they lament them. And although it is said, 'One baptism,' that is to say, one common baptism, know nevertheless, that baptism is threefold: first, that of the Holy Spirit, secondly, that of water, and thirdly, that of blood; without the first the second and third do not profit, but the first can profit without the two last, for the Holy Spirit can wash the soul from sin without corporeal water and without effusion of blood. Therefore, in water-baptism, the Holy Spirit cleanses the soul, but the water the body; and thus many saints have been saved without being corporeally immersed in water. But know, in order that thou mayest understand this saying of the

Lord, 'Verily I say unto you! if a man is not born of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;' 'Of water,' understand 'of wisdom,' that is, of the water of the Son of God, which flowed from his side, respecting which we read: 'I saw water issuing from the temple, from the right side, and all to whom that water reached (that is, whom it washed) were saved' (Ezek. xlvii. 1 and 9). Therefore without the washing of this water and without the Holy Spirit it is impossible to be saved: but without that corporeal water from a river or well, which did not flow from the side of Christ, a man may be saved."

This "water of wisdom" is the only instance throughout Huss's *Exposition of the Creed* of an interpretation or explanation not dictated by, or, at any rate, consonant with the principles of ordinary common sense. It is remarkable as being quite an exceptional instance of the allegorizing tendency, so common among the Fathers, in this *ad populum* work. I will conclude by appending the paragraph in which Huss winds up his exposition at the end of kap. xxviii. "But here there is a question how much must a Christian distinctly believe in order to be saved? Different persons say differently; and it may be said, that it is enough for a simple man to believe in God and in Jesus Christ. And to this effect St. John saith: 'Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God' (1 John v. 1). And further on he saith: 'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. And who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?' And thus the apostles of God always drew the people to believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and in Jesus Christ; and some saints have been martyred at once, when merely believing in the Lord Jesus. And in the Acts of the Apostles (chap. xix.) it is written, that those who said, 'We have not yet heard whether there is a Holy Spirit;' on being baptized, at the wish of Paul, in the name of Jesus Christ, and on Paul's laying his hands upon them, immediately received the Holy Spirit, and spake with tongues and prophesied. Know, however, that those to whom God has granted to believe more and more distinctly, are bound to believe more; so that a man

possessing understanding ought to believe in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and all that Christ desires to be believed. And those to whom God has granted to hear the truth, but they disregard it, are more guilty; as are false Christians, and especially the clergy, who understand writing, and those who hear many sermons."

Thus ends the first portion of John Huss's popular theological work on the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer.

A. H. WRATISLAW.



Syro-Egyptian Society, Nov. 5.—W. H. Black, Esq., in the chair.—Mr. Kraus, of Jerusalem, exhibited two MSS. of the Samaritan Pentateuch, written on vellum, in book form. One of these is reported to be extremely old. At the end of Genesis there is a note written by Ithamar, said to be the great-grandson of Aaron, to the effect that the MS. was written by the command of a prince of the tribe of Ephraim, appointing that it should be read in the house of the high priest on the seventh month in every Sabbatical year, to which Ithamar adds his approval. At the end of Numbers there is a note which says that this MS. was, by the command of Cyrus, cast into the fire, but that the fire could not touch it; thus identifying it with the one mentioned in the Samaritan Book of Joshua. Apart, however, from these traditions the MS. has evident marks of high antiquity. The other MS. is written with great care and beauty. Its history is ingeniously given in an acrostic, formed in the text of Exodus, and reads thus:—"I Jacob, son of Israel, son of Joseph the priest, who is of the children of Marderor, the priests, in the city of Damascus, have written this Holy Law for the good and dear priest Ishmael, son of Saba, and for the good and dear priest Abiasi, in the year seven hundred and thirty-eight of the empire of the children of Ishmael. Thanks be to God." By the children of Ishmael he means the Mohammedans; the date, therefore, would answer to A.D. 1337.—A lengthy conversation took place on the merits of both MSS., which are now on sale.

BUTTER AND HONEY A "SIGN" TO AHAZ, OF EVIL;

A CRITICISM UPON ISAIAH VII. 10—16.

"10. Moreover the Lord spake again unto Ahaz, saying,

"11. Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God ; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above.

"12. But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord.

"13. And he [the prophet] said, Hear ye now, O house of David ; Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also ?

"14. Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign ; Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.

"15. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good.

"16. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings."

THE predictions of this seventh chapter of Isaiah are expressed in phraseology that, in many respects, is extremely obscure. What, for instance, are we to understand by the prediction, "*Butter and honey shall he eat?*" and what by the yet further declaration that such shall be the child's food, "*that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good?*" What is meant by "*the land which thou (Ahaz) abhorrest ;*" and which, "*before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, shall be forsaken of both her kings?*" And finally, of what, and in what sense was the birth of this child, or the circumstances that should occur in connexion therewith, (his eating butter and honey, for instance,) "*a sign?*"

The kings of Syria and Ephraim, with combined forces, were advancing against Jerusalem. It had, however, already been declared that their enterprise should be a failure. Ahaz, not having any very great confidence in the assurance that had been given to this effect, is exhorted to ask for a "sign." He re-

fuses; veiling the infidelity which prompted him to do so, by pretending to be unwilling to "tempt the Lord." His real reason undoubtedly was, either that he regarded the gods of Syria (whom he worshipped^a) as genuine deities, and was unwilling therefore to make an appeal to Jehovah, which if decisive, would put him under the necessity of abandoning their worship (see Lord's *Theol. Journ.*, ii., 640); or else (as Barnes and others), because he had already made up his mind that he would apply to the Assyrian king, Tiglath Pileser, for help, (which he did,) rather than trust to any mere promise, however confirmed.

The prophet then declares, having sternly rebuked him for his refusal to ask, "Therefore shall the Lord himself give you a sign;" and forthwith proceeds to deliver the prophecy under consideration:—

"Behold a virgin (literally *the* virgin)^b shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel; butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good; for before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings."

Of what, and in what sense, was this prediction a sign?

The supposition, so generally entertained, that the sign which, upon the refusal of Ahaz to ask, it was said, "The Lord himself shall give," was, or would be, a sign in confirmation of the promise that had already been vouchsafed (but which Ahaz distrusted) of deliverance from the danger by which Jerusalem was then threatened—together with the further supposition, that, in some way or other, the child whose birth is predicted was itself

^a "For he sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus which smote him, and he said, Because the gods of the kings of Syria help them, will I sacrifice unto them, that they may help me" (2 Chron. xxviii. 23).

^b "The Hebrew language conceives and expresses many ideas definitely, which we are accustomed to express indefinitely" (Gesenius, *Hebr. Gr.*, sect. cvii.). For instances, see Isa. iii. 5, "the or a child," *i. e.*, any, or every child, children generally; Amos iii. 12, "the or a shepherd," *i. e.*, shepherds generally; etc. The expression "*the* virgin" therefore is equally appropriate, whether we understand it as indicating generally and indefinitely the any, or every, young woman that at the period referred to shall bear a child; or whether, as pointing definitely to some particular female, or to a virgin proper,—to her, for instance, who should be the mother of our Lord.

such a sign—are, we believe, mere assumptions. Such doubtless was the sign which Ahaz had been encouraged to ask for; and, had he asked, such we may feel sure would have been the character of the sign that would have been given. But though Ahaz was encouraged to ask for such a sign, it does not follow that that which was actually given, upon his refusal to ask, was of this character. The supposition that it was perplexes the whole prophecy; and is that which more than anything else renders any interpretation of its several phrases that shall be consistent and satisfactory, not difficult merely, but (at least so we think) impossible.

If the child predicted was our Lord, how could the prediction that he, the Immanuel, should be born seven hundred years hence, be a sign or proof that a pressing and present danger should be averted? If, on the other hand, the promised child was one who should speedily be born—(for there can, we think, be little doubt that the prophecy in reference to this child was intended to have a double accomplishment—a first and near one in the birth of a certain child during the reign of Ahaz, and a remote, and in some respects a fuller one, in the person of our Lord)—how, upon this supposition even, could his birth be a sign to Ahaz that Jerusalem should be safe, and that the confederacy of Israel and Syria against it should be a failure?—seeing that, at least, some months must elapse before the child would be born, and a yet longer time before he would know (whatever may be meant by the expression) “to refuse the evil and choose the good.”

If the verses in which are predicted the birth of the child, his eating butter and honey, and that before he “shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou (Ahaz) abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings,” were the whole of the prediction—then, indeed, the interpretation that is ordinarily given of these several phrases might possibly be maintained with some show of probability; the butter and honey, which is to constitute the child’s food, might be regarded as intimating times of peace and plenty, and the prediction that the land that Ahaz abhorred was to be forsaken of both her kings, as intimating the destruction of the kings of Syria and

Ephraim respectively—though even then it would seem somewhat strange that the territories of these two kings should be spoken of as one land. But they are *not* the whole of the prediction. It proceeds:—

“The Lord shall bring upon thee, and upon thy people, and upon thy father’s house, days that have not come, from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah; even the king of Assyria. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria; and they shall come, and shall rest in the desolate valleys, and in the holes of the rocks, and upon all thorns, and upon all bushes. In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired (namely, by the king of Assyria), [whom Ahaz hired]. And it shall come to pass in that day, that a man shall nourish (or save alive) a young cow and two sheep; and it shall come to pass, from the supply of milk that they shall give, that he shall eat butter; for butter and honey shall every one eat that is left in the land.”

In reference to Scripture, Christians generally are too much addicted to the practice of breaking up continuous wholes, of drawing inferences from detached passages, of favouring favourite portions, and of passing over or caring very little for what they do not readily understand; and they have done so here. In the present instance, as the earlier portion of this prophecy received so notable an accomplishment in the birth of our Lord, we can scarcely wonder that they are more familiar with the earlier parts of this prediction than with its latter. Nevertheless, if we would arrive at its real meaning, and ascertain in what sense it was that that which is predicted would be a sign to Ahaz, it must of course be taken as a whole. Doing this, how, we would ask, can the threatenings that follow the predictions that are given in reference to the child, and in reference to his food, allow us to interpret that which is predicted of him as a sign of deliverance and safety. Doubtless the promise that had been given of the deliverance of Jerusalem from its then perils would be and was fulfilled. But the supposition that, to Ahaz, the “sign” was in any respect intended to be regarded as a pledge or confirmation of the promise, is, we believe, untenable. The “sign which the Lord will give” was, we believe, a sign of a very different kind, and had a very different design.

Ahaz, we must remember, was an openly avowed idolater. Not only did he not worship and trust in the only one true God, but upon the present occasion he is said even to have sacrificed to the gods of his enemies. "Because the gods of the kings of Syria," said he, "help them, therefore will I sacrifice to them, that they may help me" (2 Chron. xxviii. 23). Indeed, not only did he thus give proofs of a higher faith or superstitious trust in the gods of Syria than in the only one God, but eventually he even openly rejected the latter, by shutting up the temple, and putting an end to his worship.

The sign then which it might have been expected that God would give would be, not a demonstration that the promise that had been accorded of present safety might be depended upon, but a sign that should prove that He indeed was God, and that should at the same time rebuke and punish the infidelity that feared to trust in him. Nothing could do this more decisively than to predict disaster beforehand, and then, in spite of every effort on the part of Ahaz to prevent its occurrence, to fulfil the prediction. And this, we believe, was the sign selected,—this, "the sign which the Lord himself shall give." The king of Assyria assists him indeed against his present enemies, the kings of Israel and Syria; for God had promised that these kings should not prevail against him. But fresh enemies shall arise, the Edomites and the Philistines; and Ahaz will again apply to the Assyrian monarch. But God has predicted that this time, this king, instead of helping, shall ravage his territories, and lay waste his cities. Ahaz seeks to purchase his assistance by all sorts of subserviencies; he plunders the temple; he plunders his subjects; but though he can obtain promises, he cannot obtain assistance. The king of Assyria comes to him, not however to help him against his enemies, but himself to make war against him. "The Lord shall shave thee," is the declaration of one of the clauses of the prophecy before us, "with a razor that is hired;" and the Lord does it.

Instead then of the Lord's "sign" being a sign of present protection, we believe it to have been one of coming and near calamity. Accomplished prophecy is always as much a sign as miracle. As miracle is a sign that an agency that is divine has acted, so is fulfilled prediction a sign of the divinity of the

foreknowledge that predicted ; and of the divinity of the will and of the power that bring that which was predicted to pass. Both the one and the other equally attest the being, and the presence, and the action of a God. Both the one and the other then are equally " signs."

As fulfilled in our Lord, the prediction was doubtless one of blessing. But it was to have an earlier accomplishment in the time of Ahaz, or it would have been to him no sign at all. A child is to be born ; butter and honey are to be his food, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good ; before this comes to pass, the land, which in the common translation Ahaz is said to have abhorred, is to be forsaken ; and, finally, the whole land of Judea is to be ravaged and laid waste. As so fulfilled, the prediction, and the sign, (viz., its fulfilment,) were clearly a prediction and a sign not of consolation and of safety, but a prediction and a sign of calamity and punishment.

Having reached this point, let us now look into the meaning of the several obscurities of the prophecy, and see if we cannot detect in them, (so far as regards their first fulfilment,) yet further indications that it was a prediction rather of evil than of good—of calamity rather than of blessing and of safety.

First, then, what are we to understand by the words, " Butter and honey shall he eat ?" The common supposition, (which regards the prediction as a prediction of deliverance from the danger with which Jerusalem was then threatened,) is (as we have already intimated) that they are intended to indicate then when the child shall be born, there shall be plenty and peace in the land. But if this be its meaning, how is it that in ver. 22 of this same prophecy, in the midst of a description in which is foretold in detail the desolation of the country consequent upon the ravages of the armies of Assyria, we read, " And it shall come to pass from the supply of milk that shall be given by a cow and two sheep, which a man shall have saved, viz., from destruction," that " he shall eat (or live on) butter ; for butter and honey shall *every one eat that is left in the land.*" From this it would seem that to live on butter was an indication, not of prosperity but of its opposite, viz., of a ravaged and desolated land. And so also as regards the honey—for, being here spoken of as that which (together with the butter

that should be made from the milk of the few cattle that were left) was to furnish the staple of sustenance, instead of, as heretofore, corn, and wine, and meat, and oil, it must, we conceive (being a wild product), have equally indicated poverty and desolation—as much so as if the specified food had been wild figs, or acorns, or any other merely natural produce that could be obtained without tillage.

It has, indeed, been roundly asserted by some, that butter, or curdled milk, and honey, was the usual food of children; and that the expression simply denotes therefore that the child in question "would be nourished in the customary manner" (Barnes); or, since it was only in our Lord Jesus Christ that the prediction received its highest and full accomplishment, as indicating that He would be "human as well as divine—the Son of man as well as the Son of God."

Honey and curdled milk may have been the common food of the children of the poorer class, especially in the rural districts; but there is no reason to believe that it was the sole or ordinary food of children in general. And since the desolation that was to be brought upon the country by the ravages of the armies of Assyria was to be such, that the whole population would be compelled so to live, the most probable meaning of the declaration here made in reference to this otherwise apparently trivial particular as to the child's food appears to be, that he would be born either in humble circumstances, or in disastrous times; and that butter and honey would be his food, not of choice, nor because it was the usual food of children, but of necessity. Prior to fulfilment, its precise meaning was of course an enigma which accomplishment alone could explain. If in the case of our Lord it be regarded as denoting that he would be born in humble circumstances, (which to us seems the most probable interpretation;) it may have equally denoted, in that of the child in whom the prophecy had its first accomplishment, that when he (this child) should be born, the whole country would be lying desolate and untilled, in consequence of the ravages of a successful invasion. And this, we believe, was its meaning.

As regards the words "That he may know to refuse the evil,"

etc., there is, we think, (provided the above interpretation be adopted as to the reason why butter or curdled milk and honey should be the child's food), no difficulty at all. The predicted invasion and consequent destitution of the people was, of course, corrective: in other words, they were so chastised that they might know, or learn, to refuse (or avoid) the evil and choose the good. The child, as being one of them, participates in the general calamity, and is subjected to the same discipline. From the very circumstances of the case, their discipline is his, and his theirs. If butter and honey was their food, that they might know to refuse the evil, butter and honey was his also, that he too might know.

With respect to our Lord, there is a sense in which even He is said to have "learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (Heb. v. 8). There is a sense then in which it was true of Him, as well as of the first child, that butter and honey would be his food, that he too might know to refuse the evil and choose the good.

We now come to the last of our queries, viz., What land is it that is spoken of as "The land which thou (Ahaz) abhorrest," and which, "before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, shall be forsaken of both her kings?"

The common supposition in reference to the whole prediction considered as a "sign" being that, in some way or other, it was a sign of deliverance from present enemies, the usual interpretation given to these words is that "the land" so spoken of was the united land, or lands rather of Syria and Ephraim, the enemies of Ahaz; which, says Barnes, "are here designated as one land, because being united in alliance, they constituted in fact, or for the purposes of invasion and conquest, but one people;" and the prediction that within the time specified it should be forsaken of both its kings, is supposed to have been fulfilled by the slaughter of the Syrian king about a year after the date of the prophecy, and of the king of Israel a year later. But for reasons stated by Henderson and Bishop Horsley, we believe that the land in question was the Holy Land itself—the whole land of Canaan; and that the two kings consequently by whom she would be forsaken were not the kings of Israel and

Syria (as commonly supposed), but the kings of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

Of course the choice between these very opposite interpretations depends upon the sense attached to the words translated "which thou abhorrest." Now this translation, to say the least, is not very intelligible. The strict meaning of the verb so translated appears to be "*to be uneasy on account of.*" In every instance in which it occurs, as here, in Kal, it will admit of such translation, as may be seen from those instances, even as commonly translated. See Note. In Hiphil its meaning is "*to vex,*" i. e., "*to cause to be uneasy.*"^c

But, it may be asked, was it true, in point of fact, that the land was so forsaken? With respect to the kingdom of Israel, it may be said to have been forsaken of its then reigning king, Pekah, the son of Remaliah, when he was cut off in the conspiracy raised against him by Hoshea, the son of Elah, about two years from the date of this prophecy (2 Kings xv. 27—30, xvi. 1). As regards that of Judah, it is possible that it too may, at least for a time, have been forsaken of its then king, by the temporary captivity or temporary flight of Ahaz during the wars that took place when the king of Assyria invaded the land, and God "brought upon Ahaz and upon his people, and upon his father's house, days that had not been since the days that Ephraim departed from Judah." It is true that we read nothing of any such capture or flight in the books either of Chronicles or of Kings. But the account given in those books of the history of Ahaz, whose reign extended over a period of sixteen years, is so brief, that we need not wonder at this. A subsequent king, Manasseh, was captured by "the captains of the host of the king of Assyria, and even carried to Babylon" (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11); and yet in the book of Kings not the slightest intimation is given of the occurrence. Ahaz then may have been similarly captured, or may

^c KAL.—Gen. xxvi. 46, *I am weary of my life*; Exod. i. 12, *They were grieved because of the*; Lev. xx. 23, *Therefore I abhorred them*; Num. xxi. 5, *Our soul loatheth this light food*; xxii. 3, *And Moab was distressed because of*; 1 Kings xi. 25, *And he abhorred Israel*; Prov. iii. 11, *Neither be weary of his correction*; Isa. vii. 16, *The land that thou abhorrest.*

HIPHIL.—Isa. vii. 6, *Let us go up against Judah and vex it.*

etc., there is, we think, (provided the above is adopted as to the reason why butter or curd should be the child's food), no difficulty at invasion and consequent destitution of the corrective: in other words, they were might know, or learn, to refuse (or the good. The child, as being one general calamity, and is subjected the very circumstances of the calamity theirs. If butter and honey know to refuse the evil, but he too might know.

With respect to our I, is said to have "learned" (Heb. v. 8). true of Him, as well would be his food, choose the good.

We now consider it that is spoke and which, "choose the

The consideration be withdrawn. And it was so forsaken. Both Israel and Judah were invaded by their respective enemies; in each of the kingdoms was city after city successfully besieged by the invaders; and in each were the inhabitants either put to the sword or carried forth into captivity by the victorious invaders.

Such was the prophecy which, in its first fulfilment, and as a prediction of evil, was, by the accomplishment of its threatenings to chastise the infidelity of Ahaz, and to be to him "a sign" that the God whose prophet had given utterance to the prediction was indeed God; and which, in its second, and as a prediction of blessing, was, by its accomplishment in the gift of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be a sign to us and to all men that He was the promised Messiah.

That the prediction (that portion of it excepted which, pre-

"Sign" is that of the

sign, which, in the time of the

of

, because

weary of my

.. 46). "And the

their cattle" (xxxvi. 7).

of the children of Israel"

send upon thee cursing, vexa-

of the wickedness of thy doings"

altogether the word is so translated in

upwards of fifty times.

ed then, the prophecy simply declares that

because of the wickedness of] her two kings, the

be forsaken; i. e., in other words, that God's protec-

be withdrawn. And it was so forsaken. Both Israel

and Judah were invaded by their respective enemies; in each of

the kingdoms was city after city successfully besieged by

the invaders; and in each were the inhabitants either put to the

sword or carried forth into captivity by the victorious invaders.

c

ing of Assyria should ravage Judæa in the
of course, to that period exclusively),
f a twofold fulfilment,—the one a
her a fulfilment of blessing, without
tered to its phraseology, in order
is certainly very remarkable.

we may assume, was a vir-

ut in that of the second,

...ent the mere phrase-

have led one to expect, a

...mpted the selection of a word

ay, even by the prophet himself,

Young woman should conceive, would

ellous fulfilment of the prediction in the

Make manifest that the word selected was of

also (2) as regards the name. The child was to

Immanuel [*i. e.* God with us]. In the case of the first

But, such may have been the name actually given by a

ner to her child, as intimating her belief that God was with

and would bless and protect his people. In the second, it was

not that the child was so called, but that he was in reality that

which the name designated. Here again *inspiration* seems to

have prompted Isaiah to give to the child a name that in the

second fulfilment of his prediction should express a truth far

beyond that which he had himself any conception of. (3.) In

both cases the prediction, "butter and honey shall he eat," was,

as we have seen, equally applicable, as denoting in the one case

birth in disastrous times, in the other birth of humble parentage.

(4.) Equally applicable was the prediction, "that he may know

to refuse the evil and choose the good," except that in the case

of our Lord it would be in a higher and fuller sense than we

may suppose the prophet to have conceived, that he would refuse

the evil and choose the good, seeing that his refusal of the one

and choice of the other would be perfect and unfaltering. And

(5) more completely also, than when the land of Israel was only

temporarily invaded and laid waste in the days of Pekah and of

Ahaz would the land be a land forsaken of, or because of, her

kings, when our Lord should be born ; seeing that then it would

348 *Butter and Honey a "Sign" to Ahaz, of Evil.* [January,
have been without a native king, and subject to foreign domination, for upwards of six long centuries.

J. C. KNIGHT.

NOTE, *from Henry in loc.*

"There is considerable difficulty in making out the connection between verses 17 to the end of the chapter, and the preceding verses—which is frequently the case in the predictions of Scripture. For the Lord seems purposely to cast an obscurity on them, to try whether we will receive and profit by what is plain, though we cannot satisfactorily solve every obscurity."

Of course there is "considerable difficulty" so long as the preceding verses are supposed to predict only good;—and not "considerable difficulty" in the interpretation merely, but positive contradiction in the prophecy itself. But though God may have willed "difficulty" and "obscurity" for the trial of our faith, we cannot believe that he would have willed a contradiction.

EXEGESIS OF DIFFICULT TEXTS.

LUKE xxii. 66 and JOHN xix. 11.

THE use of ἀνήγαγον in the expression ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν, "led him up into their council," in Luke xxii. 66, appears somewhat to confirm the explanation of ἄνωθεν in John xix. 11, as referring to the ἄνω βουλή or Sanhedrim, which was proposed by Semler, and which entirely frees a perplexing passage from everything in the shape of difficulty. It would rather indicate that the council chamber of the Sanhedrim was an *upper* room, and not on the ground floor. Possibly it may have overlooked the spot on which our Lord was being tried before Pilate, in which case this use of ἄνωθεν along with an explanatory gesture is very natural.

ROMANS ii. 24.

The questions asked from verse 21 to verse 23 remain, according to the ordinary translation of this passage, without an answer, and verse 24, with its γὰρ, appears to have but a very feeble connection, to say the least, with that which it ought to sum up forcibly. But translate γὰρ "Yes, for," and we have everything that is wanted.

"Thou then that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that proclaimest not to steal, dost thou steal? Thou that biddest not to commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? Thou that abhorrest idols, art thou a committer of sacrilege? Thou that vauntest of the law, dost thou by the transgression of the law dishonour God? Yes, for the name of God is owing to you blasphemed among the Gentiles, as it stands written."

ROMANS vi. 5.

The use of ἀλλὰ in this passage is remarkable, and is usually passed over by commentators with simple references to grammars which do not explain it, and to passages which are perfectly irrelevant to it. In all the passages cited by Jelf, which we presume will be found to be the same as those cited by Kühner,

there is a distinct idea of opposition to be traced, whereas in this passage there is nothing of the sort. Ἀλλὰ appears here to be cumulative rather than adversative, and we can only obtain an approach to its original adversative force by supposing a kind of ellipse, which may be represented by "Nay, that is not all, but," etc. The passage will then run, "For if we have become akin to the likeness of his death, nay, [more, that is not all, but] we shall be so also to that of his resurrection." We find a similar cumulative force of ἀλλὰ in 2 Cor. vii. 11. "For see this very fact, that ye were grieved in a godly manner, what great earnestness it produced in you! nay (ἀλλὰ), what defence! nay, what indignation! nay, what fear! nay, what longing! nay, what zeal! nay, what execution of justice!"

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 1, 2.

This passage presents no serious grammatical, but a very serious logical difficulty. If we connect τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμεν ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε with δι' οὗ καὶ σώζεσθε, as is commonly done, it appears next to an absurdity for the apostle to make the salvation of his converts depend on their retention, not of the *substance*, but of the *terms* in which he originally preached the Gospel to them. Neither does it at all improve matters to connect τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμεν ὑμῖν with ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεν ὑμῖν, which is proposed by some. If, however, we take εἰ as = πότερον "whether," and connect it with γνωρίζω, we obtain a very satisfactory statement. Theophylact and Ecumenius supply us with an excellent explanation of γνωρίζω, as equivalent to ἀναμνησκω, "I remind you," "I declare to you anew." Let us translate the whole in accordance with these views. "Now I declare to you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which ye also accepted, in which ye are also standing, through which ye are also being saved, [to see] whether ye retain what terms I preached to you in. Except ye have believed in vain."

The latter clause, "except ye have believed in vain," belongs more properly, it is true, to ἐστήκατε and σώζεσθε than to the recollection of the terms of the apostle's preaching, but it exhibits an anacoluthon far too slight to stand in the way of the very satisfactory sense produced by taking εἰ = "whether" and

connecting it with *γνωρίζω*. St. Paul then proceeds to repeat his former preaching for comparison with the recollections of his converts.

1 PETER iii. 21.

In proposing a novel explanation of this passage,* in which I considered *δ* to be the cognate object instead of the subject of *σώζει*, I neglected to illustrate the use of the neuter accusative *δ*. This is very similarly used in Rom. vi. 10, “*Ὁ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὁ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ Θεῷ*,” and Gal. ii. 20, “*ὁ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ, κ.τ.λ.*”

A. H. W.

* *Journal of Sacred Literature*, for July, 1865, p. 342.

Society of Antiquaries.—November 21.—Earl Stanhope, President, in the chair.—Lord Stanhope informed the meeting that the Council had voted £50 to the funds of the Palestine Exploration Committee. His Lordship commended that exploration to the support of Fellows of the Society. Discoveries of great importance were on the point of being made, and all the good achieved by the Committee would be, in a great measure, neutralized if they were prevented from prosecuting those excavations to a successful issue.—A paper was read by the Secretary, from the pen of Miss Stokes, on two relics of early Irish Art—the Shrine of St. Moedoc, or St. Aidan, of Ferns; and the “Cumdach,” or Box of the Gospels of St. Molaise. This paper was profusely illustrated by photographs, drawings and casts. The object of Miss Stokes’s paper was to give an account of the lives of the two Saints with whom these relics are associated, and to explain the illustrations and ornaments on the relics themselves. In the case of the shrine of St. Moedoc, a question arose whether the figures, especially the three female figures, have been cast in a mould or punched out on a nucleus. Miss Stokes appeared to be of the former opinion.

THE BOOK OF JOB.—A Revised Translation.

By THE REV. J. M. RODWELL, M.A.

(Continued from p. 151.)

CHAPTER XXXV. 1—12.

Then Elihu took up his discourse, and said :

Countest thou this for right?

Thou saidst, “ Greater my righteousness than *that* of El :”

Yet thou saidst, “ What profit is it to thee?

What does it advantage me beyond my sin ?”

I will return thee words *of answer*,

And thy friends with thee.

Look up to *the* Heavens and see,

And behold *the* clouds ; high are they above thee !

If thou sinnest, what canst thou effect against Him?

And though many thine offences, what canst thou do to Him?

If righteous, what dost thou confer on Him?

And what will He receive at thy hand?

Thy wickedness can affect but one like thyself,*

And thy righteousness, a son of man.

Be it that men groan for *the* multitude of oppressions,

That under *the* arm of *the* mighty they cry out,

Yet if none says, “ Where *is* Eloah my maker,

Giver of songs in the night ;

Who teaches us beyond *the* beasts of *the* earth,

And makes us wiser than *the* fowls of Heaven ”—

Then cry they (but He answers not),

On account of *the* arrogance of *the* wicked.

* Heb., *is for a man*.

CHAPTER XXXV. 13—XXXVI. 10.

Surely, El will not hear vain *outcries*,
And Shaddai will not regard them ;
Even when thou sayest thou shalt never see Him,
Thy cause is before Him ! therefore must thou wait for Him.
But now, because His anger does not^w visit,
And He greatly ignores *thy* faults,^r
Job opens his mouth *with* vanity,
He multiplies words without knowledge.

Then further spake Elihu :

Wait for me a little, and I will shew thee,
That I have yet words for Eloah.
I will take up my knowledge from afar,
And will ascribe righteousness to my Maker.
For truly my words *are* not a falsehood ;
One perfect in knowledge *is* with thee.
Lo, El is mighty, yet despises not *any*,
Mighty *by* strength of wisdom ;^y
He will not let *the* wicked live,
But will render justice to *the* distressed ;
He will not withdraw his eyes from *the* righteous,
But with kings on a throne
For ever seats them, and they are exalted ;
And if they be bound in fetters,
In cords of affliction taken,
Then He shews them their doings,
And their offences, that they have borne themselves proudly,
And He opens their ear to reproof,
And bids them to turn from evil.

^w *i. e.*, as thou deservest.

^r Lit., *and he knows not transgression well.*
Heb., *heart*.

CHAPTER XXXVI. 11—23.

If they hearken, and do Him service,
 They will complete their days in good,
 And their years in pleasures;
 But if they hearken not, they will perish by the dart,
 And, for lack of knowledge, die.
 But *the* impious of heart cherish anger,^a
 They cry not to Him when He binds them;
 Their soul dies in youth,
 And their life is among *the* bestial;^a
 But He delivers the afflicted in their affliction,
 And opens their ear in calamity;
 Thee too will He hasten out of *the* jaws^b of distress,
 Into a wide space wherein *is* no straitness,
 And the food set down on thy table^c shall be full of fatness;
 But thou hast been full of wicked judgment,
 Therefore have judgment and justice held close together.
 For there is wrath *on thy part* :
 Take heed lest it mislead thee in its abundance,
 And the great ransom^d lead thee astray !
 Will He value thy riches ?
 Not gold, nor all *the* powers of strength !
 Pant not for the night,
 Wherein peoples are cut off on the spot ;
 Beware lest thou turn to wickedness—
 For, this hast thou preferred to affliction.
 Lo, El is exalted in His prowess !
 Who a teacher like Him ?
 Who has prescribed to Him His way ?
 And who has said, “Thou hast wrought evil?”

^a That is, against God.

^a The priests of Astarte or Venus, scorta mascula, dying before their time.

^b Heb., *mouth*.

^c Heb., *and (the) setting down upon thy table*.

^d Thy past good deeds on which thou reliest as thy hope of escape.

CHAPTER XXXVI. 23—XXXVII. 4.

Remember that thou extol His work,
 The object of men's regard,^e
 On which all men gaze,
And mortals contemplate them from afar.

Lo, El is high beyond our ken,
 The number of His years is countless !

When He draws up *the* drops of water,
 They pour down rain and form His vapour,^f
 Which *the* clouds distil,
And drop down on men plenteously.

Yea, who can understand *the* outspreading of the clouds ?
 The crashings of His pavilion ?

Lo, He spreads out His light around Him,
 Or in the depths^g of the sea covereth Himself ;

For by these He judges peoples,
 And, furnishes food in plenty ;

He clothes *His* hands with *the* lightning,
 And gives it charge against *his* foe ;

His thunder announces Him ;
 The cattle also *are conscious* of *its* rising ;^h
 At this also my heart throbs,
 And leaps out of its place.

Hear, hear ye the tumult of His voice,
 And *the* muttering that issues from His mouth ;

He sends it straight across the whole heaven,
 And His lightning to *the* wings of the earth ;

After it roars a voice,
 With His majestic voice He thunders,
 He holds them not back when His voice is heard.

^e Heb., *which men have contemplated*.^f Lit., *for his vapour*.^g Heb., *roots*.^h Or, *its crash announces concerning him (that it is) jealousy, wrath at iniquity*. So Hitzig.—Locus obscurissimus, says Gesenius, *Theo.*, p. 1222. Delitzsch renders as in the text, but Fuerst (*Lex.*, p. 860) as Hitzig.

CHAPTER XXXVII. 5—18.

El thunders wondrously with His voice,
 He does great things beyond our ken ;
 For He says to the snow, " Be thou *on the* earth,"
 Also, to *the* rain-shower, and to *the* heavy rains of His
 strength ;
 He seals upⁱ every man's hand,
 That men, His handywork, may all acknowledge *Him* !
 Then enters *the* wild beast its covert,
 And in its lair abides ;
 From the South comes up *the* tempest,
 And from the North, *the* cold ;
 By the breath of El *the* ice is given,
 And the broad waters are confined ;^j
 Yea, He charges *the* thick-cloud with rain,
 He drives on His lightning-cloud ;
 By His guidance^k it is turned hither and thither,^l
 To accomplish all His behests,
 On *the* face of *the* world, *on* earth,
 Whether for a scourge, or for His land,
 Or for mercy, He cause it to come.
 Job, give ear to this,
 Stand still, and scan El's wondrous works !
 Knowest thou why Eloah planned them,^m
 And made His clouds to gleam with light ?ⁿ
 Knowest thou of *the* poisonings of *the* clouds,
 The marvels of *Him who* is perfect in knowledge ?
 Thou whose garments *become* warm,
 When with *the* south-wind He stills *the* earth ?
 Hast thou, with Him, spread out^o the sky,
 Strong like a molten mirror ?

ⁱ That is, hinders from manual labours.

^j Heb., *and breadth of waters (is) in a strait.*

^l Heb., *circuits.*

^k Or, *counsels* ; lit., *pilotage.*

^m Heb., *set*, i. e., his heart or mind.

ⁿ Heb., *and caused to shine (the) light of His cloud.*

^o Heb., *beaten out thin.*

CHAPTER XXXVII. 19—XXXVIII. 7.

Teach us what we can say unto Him . . . !

We cannot order *our words* for darkness.

Shall it be told Him that I speak,

If a man shall say that he is destroyed?^p

For even on *the* sun man cannot look,

When^q bright among the clouds,

And a wind has passed and cleared them off,

When after the north-wind he comes forth in golden
brightness!^r

Awful is Eloah's majesty !

Shaddai ! we cannot find Him out !

Great in might and judgment and abundant in equity !

To no man will He render an account.^s

Therefore let men fear Him !

Not all *the* wise of heart will He regard.^t

Then Jehovah answered Job out of the tempest, and said :

Who is this that darkens *My* counsel,

By words devoid of knowledge ?

Gird up thy loins now like a man,

And I will question thee, and do thou inform me.

¶ Where wast thou when I founded *the* earth ?

Tell, if thou skillest of understanding ;

Who set its measures ?—if thou knowest—

Or who stretched out a line upon it ?

On what were its foundations sunk,

Or who laid its corner-stone ?

(When *the* stars of morning sang in concert,

And all *the* sons of Elohim shouted joyously ;)

^p In allusion to Job's passionate demands to be heard by God.

^q Psalm xviii. 13, כִּנְיָה נִגְדוּ עָבְרֵי עָבְרֵי.

^r Literally, *he comes (emerges) gold*. See the Sept.

^s Heb., *He will not answer*.

^t Or, with Rosenmüller, (*whom*) *not even the wise-hearted can behold*.

CHAPTER XXXVIII. 8—22.

And shut in the sea with doors,
When it burst forth, issuing from *the* womb ;*

When I made cloud its garment
And deep darkness its swaddling-band ;

When I measured for it My bound,
And set a bar and doors ;

And said, " Hitherto shalt thou come, and not beyond,
And here shall the pride of thy waves be stayed ?"†

¶ Hast thou, in all thy days, given orders to *the* morn ?
Hast thou caused the day-spring to know its place,
That it should lay hold upon the skirts of the earth,
And *the* wicked be shaken out of her ?
She is changed like clay under a seal,‡
And *all things* stand out as if *in their* attire ;
But from *the* wicked is their light withholden,
Broken, *the* uplifted arm.

¶ Hast thou gone to the fountains of *the* sea,
And walked *the* recesses of *the* deep ?

¶ Have *the* gates of death been laid open to thee ?
And hast thou seen *the* portals of *the* death-shadow ?

¶ Art thou acquainted with the breadth of earth ?
Tell, if thou knowest it all.

¶ Which is the way to the abode of light ?
And darkness—where its place ?

Because thou didst take it to its territory,
And because thou understandest the paths to its abode !
Thou knowest it, for thou wast then born !
And great *the* number of thy days !‡

¶ Hast thou gone to *the* treasures of snow,
And seen *the* arsenals of hail,

* That is, of the earth. Lit., (*when it*) issued.

† Heb., *here shall one set (a limit) to, or, lay (hand) on, the pride of thy waves.*

‡ Heb., *as clay of a seal.*

• Ironical.

CHAPTER XXXVIII. 23—36.

Which I reserve for time of trouble,
For a day of conflict and of war?

¶ By what way is light departed,
And *the* east wind break forth^y over *the* earth?

Who has cleft a channel for the rain-torrent,
And a way for the flash of *the* thunder-voices?

That it may rain on an unpeopled land,
A desert where man *is* not,

To saturate waste and desolation,
And make grass-land put forth herbage?

¶ Has the rain a father?
Or, who begat *the* dew-drops?
From whose womb came forth the ice?
And heaven's hoar-frost,—who has gendered it?—
When like a stone the waters hide themselves,
And *the* surface of *the* deep coheres.

¶ Didst thou bind *the* bands of *the* Cluster?^a
Or canst thou loose *the* fetters of *the* impious Giant?
Canst thou bring forth *the* constellations in their season?
And *the* Wain and her train^a—canst thou guide them?
Knowest thou *the* laws of Heaven?
Canst thou settle its influence on the earth?

¶ Canst thou raise thy voice to *the* clouds,
So that abundance of water shall overhang thee?
Canst thou send forth lightnings, so that they go?
And say to thee, “Behold us?”^b

¶ Who has put wisdom in the reins?
Or who has given intelligence to the mind?

^y Heb., *scatter itself*.

^a *i. e.*, sustain the Pleiads in their indissoluble cluster or heap. The giant is Orion.

^a Heb., *her sons*. The three stars in the tail of the Great Bear are called by the Orientals the daughters of the Bier or Wain. ^b Or, *here we are*.

CHAPTER XXXVIII. 37—XXXIX. 10.

Who by wisdom can count *the* clouds,
 And who can empty^c *the* bottles of Heaven,
 When dust runs into a molten *mass*,
 And clods cohere together?

¶ Wilt thou hunt prey for *the* lion,
 Or satisfy *the* craving of *his* whelps,
 When they crouch in *their* dens,
 And sit in the covert, in ambush?

¶ Who provides his food for the raven,
 When his young cry to El,
And wander, for lack of food?

¶ Knowest thou *the* time when rock-goats bear?
 Watchest thou *the* travailing of roes?
 Hast thou counted *the* months *which* they fulfil?
 And knowest thou *the* time when they bring forth?
When they bow down, give birth to their young,^d
 —Cast out their throes?^e

Their young grow strong, wax great in *the* plain,
 They go forth, and return no more.

¶ Who sent out *the* wild ass, at large,
 And who loosed *the* wild-mule's bands?
 Whose home I have made *the* wilderness,
 And *the* salt waste, his dwelling;—
 He scorns *the* din of *the* city,
 And lists not *the* drivers' cries;
 What he finds^f on *the* mountains *is* his pasture,
 And he searches after all *that is* green.

¶ Will *the* buffalo be willing to serve thee?
 Will he pass a night by thy crib?
 Canst thou tether *the* buffalo to *the* furrow by his band?
 Will he harrow *the* valleys after thee?

^c Heb., *cause to lie*, i. e., slant in order to empty.

^e That is, the foetus which causes throes.

^d Heb., *cause to cleave*.

^f Heb., *search*.

CHAPTER XXXIX. 11—25.

Wilt thou trust him because his strength is great?
Or wilt thou leave thy labour to him?

Wilt thou confide in him to bring back thy grain,
And gather *it into* thy garner?

¶ The wing of *the* ostrich moves exultingly,
But is it *the* pinion and plumage of *the* stork?

No, for she abandons her eggs to the earth,
And warms them on *the* dust,

But forgets that foot may trample them,
Or beast of the field may crush them;

Harsh is she to her young, as if not her own,
Without fear that her labour *may be* in vain!

For Eloah has caused *her* to forget wisdom,
And has not meted out intelligence to her;

But when she lashes herself up on high,
She laughs at the horse and his rider.

¶ Dost thou give strength to the horse?
Dost thou clothe his neck with waving mane?

Dost thou make him bound like a locust?
His majestic snort is terror!

He paws^a in the valley, and rejoices in *his* strength;
He goes forth to confront *the* weapons;

He laughs at fear, and is not dismayed,
And recoils not from *the* sword:

The arrowsⁱ rattle upon him,
The flaming spear-head and *the* lance;—

With rush and vehemence he drinks *the* ground,
And cannot stand still at *the* voice of *the* trumpet;

As oft as it is sounded,^j he saith, “Aha!”

And scents *the* battle from afar,
The thunder of *the* chieftains and *the* shouting.

^a The Hebrew *hasida* means *stork*, or, *pious*, *affectionate*. There may be an allusion to this double meaning.

ⁱ Lit., *digs*, *scoops*.

^j Heb., *quiver*.

^k Heb., *according to the abundance of trumpet*.

CHAPTER XXXIX. 26—XL. 8.

¶ Does *the* hawk fly by thy contrivance—
 Spread forth his wings southward?
 Is it at thy command that the eagle soars,
 And that he places his eyrie on high?
On the rock he dwells and bides all night,
On the jagged rock^k and fortalice,
 Thence he espies^l *the* prey,
 His eyes behold afar;
 Even his young ones gorge blood,
 And where *the* slain *are*, there *is* he.

Then Jehovah answered Job, and said:

Is he who contended with Shaddai corrected?
 Let him who reproved Eloah answer.

Then Job answered Jehovah and said:

Lo, I am mean; what can I reply to Thee?
 I place my hand upon my mouth.
 Once have I spoken—but I will not answer!
 Twice but will add no more.

Then Jehovah answered Job out of *the* tempest, and said:

Gird up now thy loins like a man,
 I will question thee, and do thou inform Me.
 Wouldst thou also deprive^m Me of justice?
 Wilt thou condemn Me, to clear thyself?"

^k Heb., *tooth of (the) rock*.

^m Heb., *break my justice*.

^l Heb., *digs, searches*.

ⁿ Heb., *that thou mayest be just*.

CHAPTER XL. 9—22.

Hast thou then an arm like El,
 Or canst thou thunder with a voice like Him?
 Deck *thyself* now *with* pomp and majesty,
 And put on splendour and magnificence;
 Pour forth *the* overflowings of thy wrath,
 And look for every proud one, and bring him low;
 Look for every proud one, bow him down,
 And crush *the* wicked in their place;
 Hide them altogether in the dust,
 Bind fast their faces with darkness;^o
 And I, even I, will own^p to thee,
 That thine own right hand can help thee!

¶ Behold now Behemoth,^q which I have made with thee;
 He feeds on grass like the ox;
 Behold now his prowess in his loins,
 And his strength in the muscles of his flanks;
 He waves his tail like a cedar,
The sinews of his thighs interlace;
 His bones are strong-rods of brass,
 His limbs,^r bars of iron;
 Chief is he of the works^s of El;
 He that made him furnished *the tusks* like a sword.
 For *the* mountains yield him pasture,
 Where all *the* beasts of the field disport themselves;
 He lies under lotus bushes,^t
 In covert of reed and *in the* mire;
The lotus-bushes cover him *with* their shadow,
The willows of the brook environ him;

^o Heb., *in a hiding-place*.

^p Or, *praise thee, because, etc.*

^q The hippopotamus, called in Egyptian *Pihemout*, i. e., *the ox of water*; others, but with less probability, interpret of the elephant. In any case, the description is one of a partly imaginary animal. This remark also applies to the description which follows of Leviathan, i. e., the crocodile.

^r Heb., *bones*.

^s Heb., *ways*.

^t Or, *shades*, i. e., shady trees.

CHAPTER XL. 23—XLI. 12.

Lo, he flies not though *the* river is tyrannous,*
 He is fearless, though Jordan rush up to his mouth!
Can one, when he is looking,[†] catch him—
 Pierce *his* nostril with snares?

¶ Canst thou draw out Leviathan with a hook?
 Or with line *which* thou canst sink *into* his tongue?
 Canst thou pass a rush-rope through his nostril,
 Or pierce his jaw with a hook?
 Will he multiply entreaties to thee,
 Or speak soft-things to thee?
 Will he strike a bargain[‡] with thee?
 Wilt thou take him as a servant for ever?
 Canst thou play with him as with a sparrow,
 And wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?
 Do *the* companies[§] traffic with him?
 Do they part him among merchants?
 Canst thou fill his hide with darts,
 Or his head with fish-spears?
 Lay thy hand on him:—
 Think on battle: thou wilt do so no more!
 See, thy hope is belied!
 Is he cast down at the sight of thee?[¶]
 None is *so* daring as to stir him up:—
 Who then can stand before Me?
 Whom must I repay for favours first conferred?[‡]
 Under the whole heavens *all* is Mine.
 Of his limbs I will not be silent,
 And of the manner of *his* mighty deeds, and the grace of
 his armature!

* Lit., *oppresses*, is violent.

† Heb., *with his eyes*, i. e., openly, so that he may see it.

‡ Heb., *covenant*.

§ i. e., *fishermen*.

¶ Lit., *Is not his* (i. e., a man's) *hope* (of mastering him) *falsified*? *Is he indeed* cast down at the sight of him (—his opponent)?

* Lit., *who has been beforehand with me that I should repay him*?

CHAPTER XLI. 13—28.

Who has laid open *the* surface of his attire?
Who has entered into the double row of his teeth?
Who has opened *the* doors of his face?
Round about his teeth *is* terror.
The strong shields *of scales* are *his* ornament,
Shut *as with* a close seal;
Each is close to each,
So that not a breath can come between them;
Each to its fellow is made to cleave,
They cohere and cannot be sundered.
His sneezings cause a light to shine,
And his eyes are like the eyelashes of morn;
From his mouth issue torches,
Sparks of fire escape;
From his nostrils smoke comes forth,
As of boiling pot or cauldron;
His breath would kindle coals,
And a flame comes out of his mouth;
In his neck resides prowess,
And before him dances terror;
The laps of his flesh cleave together,
Hard, immoveable, upon him;
His heart *is* hard like a stone,
Aye, hard like a nether millstone:
At his uprising the mighty are afraid,
They lose themselves^a through terrors.
Let one attack him with sword, it will not stand,
Nor spear, javelin, nor cuirass.
He reckons iron as straw,
Brass, as rotten wood;
The child of *the* bow^b puts him not to flight,
Sling stones are turned with him into chaff;

^a Heb., *miss*, i. e., *their way*.^b i. e., the arrow.

CHAPTER XLI. 29—XLII. 6.

A mace is reckoned as straw,
 And he laughs at the rattle of javelin ;
 His underpart *is as the* sharp points of sherds,
 He stretches out *as it were* a threshing sledge on *the* mire ;
 He can cause *the* deep to boil like a cauldron,
 He can make *the* sea like an unguent-kettle ;^c
 He leaves behind him a path of light ;
 One would think *the* deep to be hoary.^d
 There is not his like on earth,
 Created devoid of fear ;
 He looks *boldly* upon all *the* lofty ;
 He *is* king over all *the* proud wild beasts.^e

Then Job answered Jehovah, and said :

I know that Thou canst do everything,
 And that no design is too hard^f for Thee.
 Thou saidst, “ Who *is* he that without knowledge mistakes^g
 My counsel ? ”
 Yes ! I have spoken of that which I understood not,
 Of things too wondrous for me, which I knew not.
 Thou saidst, “ Hear now, and I will speak,
 I will ask of thee, and do thou inform Me.”
 I had heard of Thee by hearing of ear,
 But now mine eye hath seen Thee ;
 I therefore retract^h and repent,
 Seated upon dust and ashes.

^c Supposed to allude to the musk-like odour diffused by the crocodile.

^d Heb., *one would reckon the deep for hoariness*.

^e Heb., *sons of pride*, or, *fierceness*.

^f Heb., *is cut off, made inaccessible*.

^g Heb., *hides, covers over (with words)*.

^h Heb., *reject*, i. e., my former words.

CHAPTER XLII. 7—17.

And it came to pass, after Jehovah had spoken these words to Job, that Jehovah said to Eliphaz the Temanite, "My anger is kindled against thee and against thy two friends, because ye have not spoken aright concerning Me, like my servant Job. Therefore, now, take to you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer them up as an offering on your behalf; and Job my servant shall intercede for you; for unto him will I surely have respect, so as not to inflict on you the punishment of your folly, for ye have not spoken aright concerning Me, like my servant Job."

Therefore Eliphaz the Temanite, and Bildad the Shuchite, and Tsophar the Naamathite, went and did as Jehovah bade them. And Jehovah had respect unto Job; and Jehovah turned the captivity of Job, after he had interceded for his friends: and Jehovah increased all that Job had twofold.

Then came to him all his brethren, and all his sisters, and all who had known him aforetime, and ate bread with him in his house; and condoledⁱ with him, and comforted him, for all the evil which Jehovah had brought upon him.

Then they gave him each one kesitalf,^j and each one golden nose-ring; and Jehovah blessed the latter end of Job beyond his beginning; for he had fourteen thousand sheep, and six thousand camels, and one thousand yoke of oxen, and one thousand she-asses.

He had also seven sons and three daughters. And he called the name of the first Jemima,^k and the name of the second Cassia, and the name of the third Keren-happuch;^l and in all the land were no women found so fair as the daughters of Job. And their father gave them an inheritance among their brethren.

After this Job lived an hundred and forty years, and beheld his sons, and his sons' sons, four generations.

So Job died, old and full of days.

ⁱ Heb., *shook (their heads) at him*.

^j A measure of gold or silver. Probably a coin containing about four shekels. Compare Gen. xxxiii. 19, and xxiii. 16.

^k That is, dove, or day-like.

^l That is, paint-horn.

THE TRANSFIGURATION OF CHRIST.*

BY DR. G. BRUCKNER.

It is remarkable that the Evangelist John passed over in silence the history of the transfiguration, as well as two other extraordinary events which he alone of the four evangelists witnessed. viz., the raising of Jairus's daughter and our Lord's agony in the garden of Gethsemane. No preceding fact in the Gospels would seem so well suited to the pure and spiritual character of his narrative as this scene upon the holy mountain, because none is so full of heavenly sublimity, or approximates so closely to that sea of light which swells and overflows in the first chapter of St. John. We know how this silence is usually explained. "In the Gospel of St. John," says Olshausen (on Matt. xxvi. 36), "we find many omissions which commentators have carefully set forth;" and again, "I hold it impossible to give any other reason for these omissions than those above stated" (*i. e.*, that it is a supplement). In truth, none of the Gospels shew so much originality, or stand by themselves so independently, as the fourth. It was not written as a mere supplement to the others, but it stands out prominently as a main pillar and foundation of the truth. If we possessed it alone, doubtless some important discourses and many miracles of our Lord would remain unknown, but the root of the matter would remain firm. St. John does not only give additional views of the holy character of our Lord, but he paints before us his perfect image down to its innermost consciousness, as he comprehended it by divine inspiration, and as his whole spiritual being was absorbed into its completeness. Had any one after him attempted to write a new Gospel he could have produced nothing more perfect, but would have ranked as far beneath him as he soars above his predecessors. According to Clemens Alexandrinus, when St. John perceived that the first Gospels had given the history of our Lord's natural life, he, being urged by his friends, and stirred up by the Holy Ghost, gave the spiritual side of his great undertaking.

Therefore it is that the words of Christ, in which he asserts his own divinity, and in which he promises to send the Holy

* Matt. xvii. 1—9; Mark ix. 2—9; Luke ix. 28—36.

Spirit, form the staple of this Gospel. "In the beginning was the Word," thus it commences. The previous circumstances in the life of our Lord and his miracles were already sufficiently known amongst the early Christians, yet he could not entirely pass them over, but he selected such only as involved longer discourses than the others had given. Luther remarks, in his short lecture for the first Sunday after Easter, upon St. John, and as a merit above his fellows, that he not only records the history of our Lord, but adds to it many discourses and conversations which are not to be found in the other evangelists. Of the miracles, he narrates six, only, three of which were performed in Galilee, viz., the turning of the water into wine at the marriage of Cana; the healing of the nobleman's son in Capernaum; and the feeding of three thousand persons at the sea of Tiberias. The three others took place in or near Jerusalem, viz., the healing of a man at the pool of Bethesda, who had been thirty-eight years ill; the giving of sight to a man born blind; and the raising of Lazarus in Bethany.

When at the close of the first miracle, he says, "This beginning of miracles did Jesus," etc., he did not mean that it was the beginning of all—the absolutely first—but only that it was the first for the five disciples who were then present, and especially for St. John. We can discover no reason why our Lord should not already have aided some in need in the quiet circle at Nazareth. Indeed this seems to be implied by the hint of Mary, "They have no wine," and by his answer, "What have I to do with thee? My hour is not yet come." Also by the advice, "Whatsoever he shall say to you, do it." St. Matthew had witnessed two previous acts of healing mentioned in his eighth chapter, and to Mary it may have been only one other miracle, added to the many of which she was already cognizant.

St. John details the raising of Lazarus because it was the last public miracle, and because he can include in it a number of our Lord's most important declarations concerning his person and resurrection. With this last and greatest of miracles, as with a full and swelling chord, he terminates our Lord's public ministry (John xi. 54), and with the twelfth chapter he begins

the history of the passion. Thus, the answer to the question why our Lord's transfiguration is not noticed in the fourth Gospel seems to be, "because it does not harmonize with its intention, not expressing any declaration from him as to his Godhead." The circumstances themselves shew this sufficiently without requiring further proof. On the other hand, the remaining three evangelists all relate the history of the transfiguration, and prefix to it the discourse of our Lord with his disciples at Cæsarea Philippi, "Whom say the people that *I the Son of Man* am?"

In the judgment of the multitude there seems to have been a gradation from John the Baptist up to Elias, or Jeremiah, or one of the other prophets, but no one ventured to class them with "the prophet like unto Moses." This shews us both the exceeding veneration in which that Mediator of the old covenant was held by the orthodox party, and the gross ignorance of the people and their rulers, as to the characteristics of the Messiah. The prediction about this prophet "whom God would raise up," was either disregarded, or was referred by pharisaical explanations to his expected forerunner Elias. It was quite foreign to their teaching that this mediator should be a type of the Messiah, who, when come, was to repeat the fortunes and the sufferings of his life in a higher and more glorious form. The orthodox pharisaical, and also the favourite popular belief, connected themselves much more closely with the image of David, and increased continually in expectation of a literal and material repetition of his battles and victories, only on a larger scale and with more brilliant consequences, so that the rulers could not form a just apprehension of the Godlike dignity of Christ, and their fanaticism eventually tended to the ruin of the Jewish state. Our Lord turned himself away from the judgment of these men, and his first question to his disciples, "Whom say ye that I am?" comprises his entire condemnation of their misinterpretations. "Then answered Peter, and said, Thou art the Son of the living God." This is in direct contradiction to the belief of the people, and is, consciously or unconsciously, taken from Psalm ii. 7, "Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten Thee." The nominative here is the living God, and

for the Messianic interpretation of the Psalm, this confession of Peter's may suffice. The three disciples whom our Lord had selected to be the witnesses of his transfiguration were the foremost in zeal and ability amongst the twelve, and formed that inner circle about their Master who were with him at his first restoration of the dead to life; again, at his glorification; and, finally, at his fearful struggle in the garden of Gethsemane. We must conclude that James and John fully concurred in the confession of Peter—that it was spoken from their inmost hearts, and that it was well known to him who searcheth all hearts. Upon this He called Peter a "Rock," referring, not to his person, but to his confession, and equally regarding the other two. These three apostles were afterwards called "Pillars" (Gal. ii. 9), by which the Christian Church was supported.

We now turn to the interesting inquiry about time and place—the *when* and *where* the transfiguration occurred. "And after *six* days, Jesus took with him Peter, and James, and John his brother, and led them aside to a high mountain" (Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2). St. Luke says, "*Eight* days after," because he includes, in his reckoning, both the day of our Lord's discourse and the day of the transfiguration, whilst Matthew and Mark only reckon the days which intervene from the one event to the other. But in this manner the very day which our Lord selected is pointed out. The Jews reckoned eight days from one Sabbath to another, because the seventh day is the last day of the old week, and with the eighth a new week commences. Thus we find in John xx. 26, "After eight days, when the Sabbath was past," *i.e.*, on the Sunday, and to this we are led by the ninth verse in the account of St. Matthew.

When our Lord, on his descent from the mount, commanded his three disciples, "Ye shall tell this to no man, until the Son of Man be risen from the dead," he himself classes together the transfiguration and the resurrection, implying an intimate connection between them. We shall, therefore, not greatly err, if we assume that both happened on the same day of the week, and that both took place upon a Sunday. The leading incidents in the life of Christ may have been by divine Providence so

ordained, that the early Church might see in them the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath and the institution of the Christian Sunday.

In the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, he says, "It is no longer the last day of the week, or the close of the old dispensation, but the first day of the week, the commencement of the new covenant. The day of the resurrection and glorification, *that* is the day of joy to the Christians." The shadow had vanished from the newly constituted Church, because she had received the substance of those heavenly things which, under the old covenant, were only made known by types.

It is very probable that the various appearances of the risen Lord also took place upon Sundays. We are expressly told so of the two first, and an old tradition affirms it of the third—that which occurred at the Sea of Tiberias, as related in St. John's Gospel. We must certainly regard Sunday as the day pointed out by St. Matthew, in the end of his Gospel, and by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 6, as the one upon which he made his glorious appearance on the mountain in Galilee before the apostles and the whole assembly of believers. The pouring out of the blessed Spirit took place on the seventh Sunday after Easter, and it was then that the Jewish feast of Pentecost was supplanted by the Christian. It was on "the Lord's day" that John received in Patmos the revelation of Jesus Christ, whilst the congregations founded by him were remembering the banished apostle in their prayers. In answer to them, those heavenly visions were vouchsafed to him of the future struggles and virtues of the Church. We leave it to those who disbelieve in the dispensation of the Spirit to set their meagre hypotheses in the place of the great works of God.

We have to assume that our Lord had passed the Sabbath quietly, though not in the rigorous pharisaical way, but that he went into the synagogue "as he was wont." In the evening, after the going down of the sun, he began to prepare for his transfiguration, by leaving the body of his disciples and taking with him only the chosen three, with whom he ascended the mount. Having reached the summit, he spent the night in prayer, whilst his disciples abandoned themselves to sleep

until they were awoke by the dazzling brightness of the heavenly light. St. Luke says (verse 32), "But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep, but when they awoke, they saw his glory, and the two men standing by him." Upon this follows Peter's request to make three tabernacles, "but he knew not what he said." The night resembled that blessed night of the nativity when the glory of the Lord shone upon the shepherds in the plains of Bethlehem.

If we now enquire as to the time of year in which the transfiguration Sunday fell, we find this statement in St. Luke ix. 51, "Now it came to pass, when the time was fulfilled that he should be taken hence, that he set his face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem." The time drew near when the ministry of Christ was to end, therefore immediately after the transfiguration came that final journey towards Jerusalem, of which the same evangelist has left us a minute account in the following chapters.

From these we learn that our Lord purposely lingered on the way, not following the direct route, but going through Samaria and the heart of Galilee, that he might still give aid to many who needed it, and that he might employ the time which yet remained to him before the passover to the glory of the Father who sent him, and to the benefit of those to whom he was sent. This brings us to the sixth Sunday in Epiphany, upon which day we know that the early Church directed this portion of the Gospel to be read.

II. Whilst we restrict ourselves to the Gospel account of the place upon which our Lord was glorified, we shall come upon a startling result, which will furnish us with new reasons to admire the wisdom of God, who knows so well how to fit place, as well as time, for his gracious manifestations. The evangelists all agree that the transfiguration took place upon "a high mountain," but they do not give us its name or site. The epithet which they attach to it may, however, be some guide. What was it that had previously taken place upon "a high mountain?" "Then the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and shewed him all the kingdoms of the world, and all the glory of them." The transfiguration forms

the contrast to this temptation, and each event reacts upon the other. His passion and death; his resurrection and ascension; all took place in the same locality, and most writers connect them together.

There is one other scene in the life of our Lord nearly allied to the transfiguration which occurred upon a mountain, and in which nearly the same words were spoken as those which now issued from the cloud. This is the majestic appearance of the risen Saviour recorded in Matt. xxviii. 16, and by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 6, when "he was seen by above five hundred brethren at once." Then it was that he confirmed the apostles in their office, that he instituted the sacrament of baptism, and that he announced to his followers, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Every commentator connects this declaration with the words, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him." We go but a short step further, when we suppose the mount of transfiguration to be the mountain upon which this happened, and we believe that his latest temptation, his glorification, and the sublime vision of the newly risen Saviour, all took place upon the same mountain, because of the close connection between the two last, and the intimate relation which they have to the first.

Let us compare Matt. iv. 6, "Then the devil taketh him into a high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world and all their glory, and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me," with Matt. xxviii. 16, 17, "Then the eleven disciples went into Galilee to a mountain which Jesus had appointed them, and when they saw him they worshipped him; and Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." It seems not difficult, by combining our facts, to identify the mountain as we have said.

It is well known that ecclesiastical tradition fixes the transfiguration to Mount Tabor, and modern writers endorse the opinion. It is the most prominent mountain in the plains of Jezreel, in the neighbourhood of Nazareth, and is distant from this latter city about two hours. Distinguished in the distance by its noble form, as well as by the extensive prospect from its

summit over all the surrounding country, it rises in the shape of a truncated cone abruptly from the plain to the height of one thousand feet, so that more than an hour is required for the ascent. The top is a level surface, about a mile and a half in circuit, and almost the whole way it is covered with oak and other timber. We find in Psalm lxxxix. 13, "Tabor and Hermon rejoice in thy name," *i. e.*, in thy deeds witnessed by them, and in the New Testament there is much to confirm the same testimony.

The distance of Cæsarea Philippi, where our Lord was, in the north of Palestine, is about fifty miles from Mount Tabor, a journey which he and his disciples could easily accomplish in the six intervening days. Olshausen remarks, that "we cannot extract from the gospel history that there was any change of place during this interval;" say, rather, that we cannot imagine our Lord spending his time upon the confines of the Holy Land in doing nothing. He had uttered the promise, "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here who shall not taste of death until they have seen the kingdom of God," and he was surely concerned to hasten its fulfilment. Of still more weight is it, that after the transfiguration and the healing of the lunatic boy, our Lord and his disciples "abode *still* in Galilee" (Matt. xvii. 22), "coming to Capernaum" (Mark ix. 30, 33). It is therefore clear that the mount of the transfiguration was situated *in* Galilee, and was not one of the many mountains further north, as Robinson supposes. Mount Tabor agrees perfectly well with the scene of the first temptation, as described in Matt. iv. 6, which we have already quoted.

It is not necessary for English readers to condemn all German divines as neologists, because some of them consider this temptation by the devil to have been a vision or an impression on the mind. There are others who take it in a literal sense, that the devil really did lead Him to a high mountain, from which there was a wide and commanding view, and no words can better describe the prospect from Mount Tabor. Every recent traveller confirms these graphic words of Scripture.

Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, vol. ii., p. 330) thus writes:—
"At 11¼, Mount Tabor for the first time rose upon our view in

the N.E., an hour or more distant, a fine round mountain, presenting (as here seen) the appearance of a segment of a sphere; sprinkled with old oaks to its very summit, and realizing in its graceful form and beauty all that I had been led to anticipate respecting it." Again he says (p. 354):—"The view from Tabor is very extensive and beautiful; far more so, indeed, than we had anticipated from the relative height of the adjacent mountains. The sirocco of the afternoon thickened the air, and for a time dimmed the prospect; but the next morning was again bright, and gave us the full enjoyment of one of the finest landscapes in Palestine."

On the third occasion, "the mountain" is pointedly described as being "*in Galilee*," therefore, as Tabor is the highest and most prominent hill in that country, it is most probably the one intended, and we have no doubt that tradition is right, and that Tabor was the mountain of the temptation, and of the glorious reappearance of our risen Lord, as well as of the transfiguration. On the other hand, Robinson remarks that this tradition owes its origin to the legend-loving fourth century, and that Tabor scarcely could have been the scene of the transfiguration, because long before and after that time its summit was the site of a fortified city, and that the Old Testament mentions one of the Levitical cities of the same name as lying at the foot of the mountain, or a little higher up on one of its sides. Now, although we would not ignore these facts, we attach to them little weight. Doubtless in 1 Chron. vii. 77, a Levitical city of the same name is mentioned, but in Joshua xix. 12—22, where it first occurs, it is doubtful whether the city or the mountain is intended, and, at any rate, we cannot infer from it that the town was on the top of the hill. It is much more probable that it lay at the foot, and that it was the place where our Lord left his disciples, and where they encountered the lunatic boy. It is true, that during the Jewish war, Josephus himself fortified the summit, and turned the whole hill into a fortress; and the ruins seen by Robinson belong, in all probability, to this era. The mountain had fulfilled its destiny in the household of God, having been the theatre of some of his most glorious manifestations. Now came the contrast. It was a fortress, and stood a siege. In like

manner, the lovely shores of the Lake of Gennesareth, which had witnessed most of our Lord's mighty acts, became the scenes of mourning and woe. The fight of despair took place upon its waters, and those banks on which St. Peter had laid his miraculous draught of fishes were crowded with the bodies of the slain.

Let us now turn to consider the transfiguration itself. The heavenly vision divides itself into three parts, in each of which we perceive a separate manifestation of the anointed Son of God. First, we have Christ himself in glory; secondly, the two heavenly messengers; and, thirdly, the cloud of majesty and the voice issuing from it.

Having ascended the hill at night, the three disciples abandoned themselves to sleep, whilst our Lord, as usual, gave himself to prayer. There is a marked difference between the manner in which our Lord taught *us* to pray, and *that* in which he prayed himself. Men have inquired whether our Lord himself used that prayer which bears his name, and we must answer that he did not. The very exordium does not accord with his position in regard to God, and still less could the concluding petitions have come from his mouth. His prayers were either supplications for us, or the free speech of the Son to the Father, the outpourings of a filial heart.

We have but few examples of the earnest effusions which our Lord uttered on different occasions. There is a short one in Matt. xi. 25, and a longer one as our high priest in John xvii. "I praise thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, in that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." "Father, the hour is come, that thou shouldst glorify thy Son, and that thy Son also should glorify thee. The words that thou gavest me, I have given unto them, and they have kept them, and have known assuredly that I came out from thee, and that thou has sent me. I am glorified in them, and now glorify thou me, O Father, with thine own self, with the glory that I had with thee before the world was." These and similar words our Lord spake with reference to his disciples, and they are couched in a higher tone than our poor prayers can ever assume.

Every prayer purifies the inner man, and casts a reflex of heaven upon the countenance. Can we then wonder when we are told of him, "and as He prayed He was glorified before them: His face shone as the sun, and His garments were bright as the light?" The divinity within shone forth upon Him, and so his face beamed like the sun, and his raiment became white as the snow, so that no fuller on earth could equal it in whiteness; "and everything around him seemed to be kindled by his effulgence." Luther rightly interprets the passage in St. Mark as "He glorified *Himself*."

What was it then that our Lord shewed forth when he was "*glorified*"? (Luke ix. 29). We answer, "His heavenly glory, which he had with the Father ere the world was." But in what does this consist, and what is its essence? What is it that lights up the countenance of man, and makes his eyes beam with celestial light? It is *love*. "Whoso loveth his brother," saith the apostle, "dwelleth in the light, and in him is no darkness at all; but he that hateth his brother is dark, and walketh in darkness." All is dark within him and about him (1 John iii. 10, 11).

Where is there a human countenance that is not ennobled and brightened by love? and where is the most beautiful face that is not deformed by hatred and anger? How much more then must God be the purest light, since his whole being is love? This love is the life of the Son of God; and he revealed it on the holy mountain, not by acts merely, but in all its essential fulness. "Light, love, life," are convertible terms in the writings of St. John, meaning the same thing, because one cannot exist without the other (1 John iii. 14). "We know that we have passed from death unto life, *because* we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." Therefore it is no paradox to say that his first Epistle embodies also an account of the glorification.

The disciples were awoke by the heavenly splendour which surrounded them; and found themselves in a sea of light. Their Lord was beaming with celestial brightness, and Moses and Elias stood glistening beside him, and "talking of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem."

This sounds as if the two greatest prophets of the Old Testa-

ment had appeared to *warn* him of his passion and death, and to encourage and strengthen him for them ; and this is the usual explanation in sermons and commentaries. But it does not seem to have much connection with our Lord's glorification, and still less with the other details of that event. The first announcement of the passion was by Himself, and it had long preceded his ascent of this mount, being occasioned by that discourse about his person in which the judgment of the people and of the orthodox Pharisees was discussed, and which manifested to him that at their hands he had nothing to expect but suffering and death. With consummate wisdom he had never spoken to his apostles of these, until Peter had witnessed the true confession, because until then they had never risen to so high a degree of faith. In the second announcement of his passion immediately following the transfiguration, and which he could not repeat to his disciples without a violent shock to their feelings, he added no new incidents, so that Olshausen's assertion that the messengers *revealed* to him various particulars, is without foundation. Our Lord did not require information at their hands. He knew what was awaiting him as well as man or angel could have communicated to him. The words in which the scene is described to us by St. Luke are, "They spake of his decease which he must accomplish at Jerusalem." Whoever knows the wide sense given to the word λέγειν, לָבַר in the Scriptures, will not hesitate to explain it here as *laud, praise, thank*. St. Matthew says, more minutely, "They held a conversation with him" (συλλαλεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ), which rather implies that *he* imparted to them what was to be the object of their future worship. He told them what they had not known before, which is exactly the reverse of the common explanation.

The fulfilment of the end which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem was not his death alone: it included much more; namely, his resurrection and his ascension—in short, the new glory, as the Son of *God* and *Man*, in which he then stood before them. It was the *new* kingdom of God which broke forth in the transfiguration, and which was afterwards established by his ascent from Mount Olivet. He vouchsafed to them a glimpse into his future gracious purposes, even as he had done during

their lives, and thus he turned their present blessedness into a higher bliss, so that they stood beside him as the representatives of the triumphant Church, and sang in celestial strains his present glory, even as on Christmas night the angelic hosts had sung to the shepherds, "Glory to God in the highest, and goodwill to man." This was to the disciples a foretaste of everlasting life, and Peter spoke in bewildered exultation, "Lord, it is good for us to be here; wilt thou that we should make three tabernacles, one for Thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias? But he wist not what he said."

We know that both the eminent saints who reappeared upon the mount of transfiguration had been removed from this earth in a peculiar manner. Holy Scripture tells us that Moses, "who was a faithful servant in God's house," and yet who died because of an act of unbelief, was in full strength and vigour, and was removed by God's immediate call. The Jewish rabbis translate the Hebrew literally, "By the mouth of the Lord," and add to it that God took away his soul with a kiss. He was also granted the most honourable burial that ever fell to the lot of mortal, for the Lord himself buried him (Deut. xxxiv. 6). In the Epistle of Jude, ver. 9, we find this remarkable addition, that Michael the Archangel, the guardian angel of the people of God, spoken of in Daniel and in the Revelation, "strove with the devil over the body of Moses."

This shews us what a bitter hatred the devil bears to the faithful soldiers of Christ, so that he would pursue them, if possible, even after death, and would violate their dead bodies, which he was not permitted to injure during life. But we see also that the Lord keeps and preserves even the dead bodies of his servants, and that his holy angel, the mighty champion of his people, resisted the malicious designs of the adversary, and said, "The Lord rebuke thee." Not merely did God forbid the Evil One to touch the body, but He buried it, thus shewing forth his forgiving grace to those who truly serve him. Not one hair of that sacred head could Satan touch, and yet he was buried in the land of Moab, and over against the house of Peor, in the centre of idolators, and opposite a temple in which a shameful worship was celebrated. Baal Peor was the idol, whose rites

were solemnized with licentious orgies, into which the Israelites were seduced by the deceitful counsels of Balaam; and Moses could only extirpate them by the shedding of blood (Num. xxv.). A more honourable place of sepulture this faithful servant of God could not have found. It was the hero laid in the battle-field, where he had won his hardest victory. His monument, not of man's devising, was raised by his own captain (the Captain of the Lord's host), and edged round with his protection, so that no human power could violate it; and Satan dared not assault it, though he must pass it every time he was present in the temple of Moab. "No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day" (Deut. xxxiv. 6).

In the Epistle of Jude we have an explanation of an Old Testament tradition, which agrees with the whole course of scriptural teaching about sin, death, and Satan; and of the estimation in which such teaching by tradition was held, we have another example in what he relates of Enoch (ver. 14).

We see that the death and burial of Moses turned to his everlasting honour, because they testified to the devil's hatred and God's gracious favour. So with Christ, the day of His death was the day of His finished work. His everlasting bliss and glory were foreshewed by the transfiguration.

III. We now come to the crowning act of this glorious scene. Scarcely had our Lord declared to the two heavenly witnesses His resolution to finish the work of redemption by His death and resurrection, the disciples meanwhile listening with awe and joy, than the Almighty Father sent forth His voice of approval and confirmation. "And while Peter was yet speaking, behold a *cloud* of light overshadowed them." This cloud was the symbol of God's presence in the Old Testament, for "He dwelleth in the light," "whom no man hath seen or can see." It is a blinding light even to spiritual essences, and thickest darkness to fleshly and sinful eyes, therefore equally adapted for the Highest, either to reveal or to veil His glory. This dazzling cloud enveloped our Lord in its effulgence. He was surrounded by it, and the heavenly saints stood within it; but the disciples were sore afraid, and fell with their faces to the earth. Thus we have here three groups—the three disciples in the background,

Moses and Elias in the middle distance, and our Lord himself in the cloud of light—answering to the three divisions of the temple, whose true antitype stood ever nearest to God. “And behold a voice spoke out of the cloud (the voice of the Father), This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. Hear ye Him.” These are the very words that Moses prophesied of him (Deut. xiii. 15), and that Peter used in his confession. “Thou art the Christ, the *Son* of the living God.” And this confession is confirmed in the strongest terms by the heavenly voice. Luther says, speaking of the baptism of Christ, “Then we hear the voice of the Father in a new sense, for such words as were then spoken had never been heard before.” It is very different from *that* which issued from Sinai when God also spoke from heaven, but in such wise that the earth trembled and the mountains shook, and they who heard it quaked for fear. It is not with such a voice that God here speaks, dreadful and terrible, but in accents of mercy, tenderness, and goodwill. “Children of men, turn your eyes hither, and if ye would know who this is, listen unto me. He is my beloved Son, in whom I am always well pleased: you have no cause to fear with him. If you seek a gracious Father in me, then keep close to my Son, to whom I can deny nothing. So will ye be dear unto me for his sake; therefore listen unto him, and do as he commands you.” Luther adds that, without doubt, many holy angels were present also; “for when Father, Son, and Holy Ghost reveal themselves together, there must of necessity be a company of the heavenly host.” Our Lord used words of like import after his resurrection when he testified before the united assembly, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth;” and St. Peter refers to them in his parting address to prove the divinity of Christ (2 Peter i. 17).

Do we seek for an Old Testament parallel which can be compared to the transfiguration? Shall we not trace something resembling it in the life of Moses when he ascended Mount Sinai with Aaron and his sons to receive the Law, and when, in consequence of his nearness to the divine presence, his face shone so that he had to veil it before the children of Israel (Exod. xxiv. 24—30). Most commentators compare these two together,

although St. Paul, in 2 Cor. iii. 4, opposes Moses to the priesthood of the New Covenant, in order to enhance the superiority of the latter. Perhaps the transfiguration answers nearer to the divine appearance in the fiery bush, though that dazzling but unconsuming fire which appeared to Moses in Horeb is more commonly supposed to typify the fiery trial under which the people of God were groaning in Egypt, under which he supported them, and under which they even increased and multiplied. The Scottish Church, so great in struggles and in sufferings, has chosen the burning bush for its symbol, with the motto, "*Nec tamen consumebatur.*" It is, however, evident that we have not here merely a vision symbolising to Moses the fate of his people, but a direct manifestation of the Eternal. Light and fire were always emblems of the divine glory. The bush which burnt and was not consumed, out of which the angel of the Lord spake, is an image of the Son of God, who took upon him our nature without annihilating it, but, on the contrary, purified and glorified it, as on Mount Tabor. This point is decided by Deut. xxxiii. 16, where "the blessing of Him who dwelt in the bush" is invoked upon the head of Joseph. Translated into the language of the New Testament these words would run, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you" (1 Cor. xv. 12). Again—"The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (John i. 14). Seen by the light of the transfiguration, these words receive their full import and signification. Moses approached with bare feet and holy fear. The disciples fell upon their faces, and even the witnesses from heaven stood reverently before the Lord of glory. The first vision was followed by the deliverance of Israel from the land of bondage; the last by the deliverance of the faithful from the power of Death, and their entrance into the land of peace.

Thus the transfiguration presents us, not with an ordinary, but an extraordinary evidence of the divinity of Christ, and, in adaptation to its object, stands in direct contrast to his temptation by the devil, and takes rank with his birth, his resurrection, and his ascension.

In conclusion, let us cast a glance at the celebrated picture

by Raffaele representing this subject, which is in the Vatican at Rome. It was the great master's last work, and for completeness of detail, warmth of colouring, and beauty of effect, is, with justice, accounted his best. The Saviour floats above the earth, in a glory of light, between Moses and Elias, who are looking up to him. The three disciples lie beneath on the ground, veiling their mortal eyes from the brightness which beams from their Master. At the foot of the mountain are assembled the other disciples, occupied with a poor lunatic boy, in whom the Evil One is provoking the spirit of self-destruction. His figure is prominent in front. With pale lips, wan countenance, and clenched fist he points upwards, as if aware of the impotent wrath of the devil, who cannot hinder the transfiguration. All the disciples are referring the unhappy and supplicating father to their Lord above, as the only potentate able to subdue the Evil One, thus testifying, through the confession of their own utter incapacity, to his superior and transcendent power.

Our Protestant interpretation in so far differs from the Roman Catholic that we do not regard our Lord as enclosed by the heavenly messengers on both sides, but as having both near him; not looking up to him, but standing in an attitude of supplication before him. In Luke ix. 33 we find, "It came to pass, as they departed from him, there came a cloud and overshadowed him, and they feared as they entered into the cloud." The contrast of the two scenes upon the summit of the mountain and at its foot is of the highest ability, and stamps the master as having been not only a great artist, but also a good and orthodox theologian.^b

^b The foregoing article and that on the Invention of the Alphabet, p. 178, have been translated by Mrs. Hamilton Gray, but we have not scrupled to alter some of the expressions, and to remove some passages, though not all, which we objected to. We could not possibly persuade ourselves to print them as they reached us.—ED. J. S. L.

THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT.—ITS GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

“Thine is the kingdom, O Lord! and thou art exalted as head above all.”—

2 Chron. xxix. 11.

WHEN the human mind has once imbibed a conviction that the universe has been created by an eternal, all-powerful, and universally present Being, it naturally passes to the consideration of the manner in which the moral and material systems are governed.

That the same Being who created should also govern appears so consonant to reason, that men are apt to assent to the general proposition, without paying much attention to the subordinate truths which it involves. The consequence is, that many individuals, while admitting the general fact, demur to some of the most important of the subordinate truths; and there has hence arisen a vast amount of controversy and difference of opinion, in regard to the principles on which the universe is governed by its Divine Ruler. The subject has in this manner become one of the most complex and difficult with which the student of sacred truth has to deal; and it accordingly requires to be approached with a corresponding degree of caution and care. Erroneous methods of research are doubtless the origin of much of the perplexity in which many inquirers have found themselves involved, and of that apparent discrepancy between the conclusions deducible by abstract reasoning from first principles, and the interpretations which have been put on various passages of Scripture, bearing more or less on this important topic. Some of the questions embraced in this field of research are of a nature so recondite, as to render it difficult to apply any of the more exact methods towards their solution. These accordingly cannot be said to admit of more than an approximate determination, and in regard to such there is great room for latitude of opinion.

The subordinate points involved in the general doctrine of the divine government are so numerous, that our attention must be confined to a few.

In order to form a correct idea of the general principles or plan upon which the government of the universe appears to be conducted, it is needful to have clear and distinct conceptions of

the attributes, volition, and purposes of the Deity. These points will, therefore, claim our earliest attention.

The divine attributes are those properties which the human mind conceives to be of necessity involved in that idea of the nature and character of the Deity which is derived from reason and Scripture. They may be clearly distinguished into primary and secondary—the former being such as are uncompounded and underived ; while the latter are either modifications of the former, or have some necessary dependence upon them. From the lights furnished by reason and Scripture then, we conceive of the Deity as possessing the five following primary attributes : 1st, eternity ; 2nd, omnipresence ; 3rd, infinite power ; 4th, infinite wisdom ; and 5th, infinite goodness. These are all perfectly distinct : it cannot be affirmed that any one of them is the result of any other, or of any combinations of the others. All the rest of the divine attributes are secondary ; his mercy is a modification of his goodness ; his justice is a combination of his goodness and wisdom ; his knowledge results from a combination of his wisdom with his omnipresence, eternity, and power ; his truth from a combination of his knowledge with his goodness ; while his holiness is simply the immaculate perfection of all his attributes—his entire freedom from defect or blemish of any kind—a freedom which can be absolutely affirmed of no other being, save God alone.

It is needful to keep these several relations distinctly in view, with reference to the discussions that are to follow ; and it is particularly requisite to preserve a clear idea of the divine knowledge, viewed as distinct from God's infinite capacity of knowing. The former is the effect, the latter the cause—a distinction which it is important to keep steadily before the mind. The divine knowledge results, as above indicated, from a combination of the wisdom with the omnipresence, eternity, and power of the Deity. It is because God is infinitely wise, and has an infinite power of knowing, and has, from all eternity, been every where present, and has power to carry out all his designs, that we judge his knowledge to embrace everything capable of being known. The true idea of omniscience is, that it is the knowledge of every thing knowable ; and it is an erroneous conception of that attri-

bute to suppose that it of necessity excludes the possibility of there being anything which, in its own nature, or by the constitution which God himself has given to it, is unknowable; for that such things there are is not to be denied. For example, the exact square-root of the number 2, in the decimal system of arithmetic, is of this description. It is no violation of our notions of the divine omniscience to say that the Deity cannot know the exact square-root of 2—that is, a number which, multiplied by itself, will yield the number 2; because this root is a fraction of indefinite amount, represented by an infinite series of fractional numbers. The last term of the series, therefore, cannot be known even by an omniscient mind; for if it could, the series would cease to be infinite. To whatever extent the series may be prolonged, it is impossible to arrive at a term which can be regarded as the last. Now there are various other quantities which are similarly constituted; and if there be abstract quantities thus incapable of being known, there may be other things which God has so constituted as to be in their own nature unknowable.

With regard to events, some theologians teach that we ought to conceive of the Deity as viewing all events as present—that to his infinite mind there can be no such thing as past and future, but that all events are, ever have been, and ever will be present. Now this conception might possibly be correct, were the difference between past, present, and future only imaginary—a mere conception of the created mind. The difference, however, between past and future events is not imaginary, but real. No man can be brought to believe that there is no real difference between the instant of his birth and that of his death—that the interval is a mere illusion of the fancy, and that, could he only view matters in their true light, he should find his birth, his life, and his death to be all simultaneous. Now the finite mind is only an imperfect copy of the infinite; and if the former perceive that there is a real difference between past and future events, much more must the latter.

According to the theologians above referred to, the Deity must view the creation of the world, its present subsistence and its future destruction, as simultaneous in point of time; while,

as respects man, the Deity does not distinguish between the period of his birth, of his mortal existence, of his death, of his resurrection and his future existence throughout eternity, but that all these events are and ever have been viewed by him as present. From this notion it would follow that there is no uncertainty in the fate of men, but that, as respects those individuals who are hereafter to attain to endless happiness, and those who are to be plunged into enduring misery, the Deity, at the moment of their mortal birth, views the former as already in a state of immortal bliss, and the latter as already in a state of enduring woe; or rather we must imagine the Deity to have so viewed the individuals composing these two classes from all eternity. We must hence regard the future state of individuals to have been, not only before their birth, but from all eternity, fixed by an immutable predetermination of the Deity, or else by an immutable necessity, which the Deity foresees, or rather views as ever present to his mind, but which he neither originated nor can alter or control.

Now this notion, so far from exalting our conceptions of the Divine Mind, as its authors intend, attributes to it a deficiency—an inability to distinguish where there is a real difference. No man can doubt that the distinction between past, present, and future has its foundation—not in the human imagination alone, but in the nature of things, and that our perception of that distinction is imparted to us by the Creator of the human mind, and is a reflection of his own manner of regarding it. No fallacy then can be greater than to suppose the Deity to regard past and future events as both present and simultaneously proceeding; for he cannot fail to perceive a distinction between those which are past and those which are future, and between both of these and the events which are at any instant in progress. He regards the creation of the world as past, its destruction and renovation as yet to come. He views the birth of all living men as past—their mortal life as present; their death, resurrection, and subsequent everlasting existence as future. The human mind is unable to conceive the possibility of the Divine Mind's viewing events in any other manner than this: for however learnedly theologians may discourse of an "eternal now," and

about all events as being ever equally present to the Divine Mind, they can assign no reasonable grounds for such an idea, save their own erroneous notion of the nature of omniscience.

Existence of some kind is absolutely necessary to render any thing knowable. Whatever constitutes the object or subject of knowledge must have existed formerly, or must exist now, either in fact, or in the already formed intention of the Divine, or of some created mind. An intention yet to be formed, unless it be the necessary result of some subsisting natural law, is a non-entity; consequently it cannot be the subject of knowledge.

As regards events, the human mind perceives that those which are past or present must of necessity fall under the cognizance of the Deity, by reason of his eternity, his omnipresence, and his infinite capacity of knowing. But with regard to those that are future, there exists a necessary connection between God's knowledge of such, and the nature of the divine volition and purposes. Indeed the question, respecting the nature and extent of God's foreknowledge, is so dependent on the conceptions which may be formed of the divine volition, that the further consideration of the former must be deferred, till some advance be made in the discussion of the latter topic.

The divine will must be regarded as the ultimate source of all causation—the great prime mover of the universe. We cannot imagine that, when God first resolved to give existence to other beings, his will must have been actuated by motives. Such a notion would only drive us a step further back in the chain, to look for some source whence these motives themselves arose. They could have had their origin nowhere except in the Divine Mind itself; for there was at first no other mind in the universe, and we should thus be forced into the supposition of supposing the Deity to have created motives for influencing his own will. But we cannot imagine him to have created such motives unwillingly, in obedience to some necessity; for that would be to make necessity, and not God, the prime mover of all things. If God created motives then, it must have been by an exercise of volition; and then we are driven to look for a motive for that act; so that we should thus never come to an end in the chain of causation, were we not to recognize the will of God to be itself

the first cause—a prime mover acting without motives, in virtue of a self-determining power. This is one of those ultimate facts beyond which reason cannot go. It is impossible for us to understand how the will of the Deity can act without being influenced by motives ; we merely see that its so acting is a necessary element in our conceptions of the Divine Mind.

Let us now examine the connection subsisting between the divine volition and the designs and purposes of God. Seeing we cannot conceive of the Deity otherwise than as an absolutely perfect and holy being, it is impossible to suppose that there can be any incongruity or inconsistency in the divine nature or character. Hence it cannot be imagined that the divine purposes or designs are in any sense or to any degree inconsistent with the divine will and character, or that the Deity formed any of his purposes unwillingly. There must be a perfect harmony between his will and his designs.

There must, in like manner, be an entire agreement between the designs and the knowledge of the Deity. He must know his own intentions, and his knowledge must be in exact conformity with his intentions. It is therefore impossible to suppose God to foreknow that any event shall certainly happen, unless he intend that it shall so certainly happen ; for that would be to imagine that there may be events which must of necessity happen, and of which the Deity has certain foreknowledge ; but which nevertheless he does not intend to happen ; in other words, that there are events which God foresees must take place whether he will or no—an idea from which the understanding revolts.

Keeping in view what has been affirmed of the harmony that must subsist between the divine will and intentions, let us consider the nature of moral evil. We cannot imagine otherwise of moral evil, than that it is something discordant to God's will and character—consequently opposed to his primary designs and intentions. Hence it is impossible to conceive of moral evil as having been positively and primarily designed, or intended by the Deity, to have a necessary existence ; for this would be to suppose God to have intended opposition to his own intentions—to have resolved to create an opposition to his own will and designs ; and this is a conception which the human mind feels it impos-

sible to form. Every idea therefore of moral evil, which would lead to the conclusion that the Deity primarily designed that it should exist, must of necessity be false.

For example: Were we to suppose moral evil to be the necessary result of an inherent metaphysical imperfection in the creature, we must thence conclude that God, having constituted the creature thus metaphysically imperfect, designed that moral evil should be a necessary ingredient in the character of every such created mind. Again: Were we to imagine moral evil to be necessary, in order, by contrast, to develop in full perfection what there is of moral good in the created mind, the result would be the same; for were moral evil needful to elicit moral good, it would cease to be evil in its essential character, seeing its effects would be beneficial; and such a necessity for the existence of moral evil in order to the full development of moral good could not have arisen otherwise than from a design of the Deity, who must consequently, on this supposition, have primarily intended that moral evil should certainly exist. It is quite true that God does so overrule moral evil as to cause it to elicit moral good; but this is very different from rendering the full development of moral good in the creature dependent on the existence of moral evil. The only correct notion of moral evil, then, is that it is the opposition of the will of the creature to that of the Creator—an idea which, of necessity, excludes the possibility of God's being in any sense its author.

Combining this idea of moral evil with what has been affirmed of the relation between the divine intentions and foreknowledge, and seeing it is impossible to imagine God to have intended that moral evil should certainly exist, it necessarily follows that the mind cannot conceive of God as having foreknown that moral evil should certainly exist. It does not, however, follow from what has been stated, that the mind cannot conceive of the designs of the Deity as having been such as necessarily to embrace the *possible* existence of moral evil, or imagine that his designs may in themselves be perfectly good and holy, notwithstanding they embrace this necessary possibility. How this might be, however, must form the subject of further investigation. Neither does it follow, from what has been said, that the

mind cannot conceive of God as having foreknown the existence of moral evil merely as a possibility, because if its existence really was only possible, we cannot imagine God to have viewed it as certain, contrary to what He himself had designed it to be. How we may form such a conception without disturbing our notions of the divine omniscience is also matter for further investigation.

We come now to the main branch of our inquiry, viz., what are the general principles on which the government of the universe appears to be conducted? But, first of all, let us fix upon the method of investigation which it will be most expedient to adopt. This subject is doubtless capable of a rigid inductive demonstration; but the induction must be founded on so extensive a basis that it would require a volume to do it justice. Indeed, the inductive demonstration of this subject may be said to form a separate science—the philosophy of history. It is, therefore, necessary to have recourse here to a more summary method, and rest contented with an approximate result. The method of exhaustion is the most likely to bring us near the truth, although the conclusion which may be thus attained will not reach higher than a fair probability.

It would, indeed, be difficult to exhaust all the possible suppositions which the human mind might form to itself in regard to the general plan of the divine government, and it is, therefore, needful to make a selection. We shall accordingly take three which present the most striking contrasts one to another, and involve the most important principles.

The first supposition is that God has, from all eternity, decreed that all events shall fall out according to a single determinate order of succession, from which there never has been and never can be the smallest possible deviation. This is the doctrine of absolute predestination, and it of necessity excludes the idea of a contingency; for, according to this view, nothing is possible in futurity except what God has decreed to happen—all uncertainty on the subject of future events, arising not out of any uncertainty attached to the events themselves, but solely out of our ignorance of God's decrees.

The second supposition is that the Deity at first gave to

all his creatures, both animate and inanimate, rational and irrational, certain properties and powers, and subjected them to certain fixed laws, with the operation of which He never interferes. That all events in which material or irrational agents alone are concerned fall out with undeviating certainty, according to the operation of those fixed laws on these powers and properties. Lastly, that God having conferred on his rational creatures a power of free volition, such freedom is the law of their constitution, and all events in which they are concerned are regulated by the operation of this law, which renders them of uncertain issue, and dependent on the mode in which such voluntary agents exercise their freedom.

The third supposition is that, while the Deity at first gave to all his creatures, animate and inanimate, rational and irrational, certain properties and powers, and subjected them to certain fixed laws, there is nevertheless required for the maintenance of those properties and powers, and for the continued operation of those laws, a sustained and unceasing exercise of divine power. That all events in which only material or irrational agents are concerned usually fall out in exact accordance with the powers and properties of those agents, and the operation of the laws by which they are governed, but that occasionally the Deity overrules these laws, bending them to his own direct and immediate volition, for the accomplishment of certain great moral ends. That as regards events involving the actions of beings endowed with reason and volition, again they are of an exceedingly complex character. That all such beings, having been subjected to certain laws, their volitions are usually exercised under the influence of those laws: but that the Deity does occasionally overrule their operation, bending them to his own immediate volition, so as to bring about certain definite results. Moreover, that God does not unfrequently, for wise ends, place the wills of his creatures in such circumstances as to call into exercise, within certain limits, that amount of freedom of choice, or self-determining power, which He has been pleased to confer upon them, so rendering certain special issues contingent upon the manner in which they exercise that power. That such contingencies, however, are always of God's special appointment,

and exceptions to the general tenor of his government, which general tenor constitutes the laws of the universe as respects both matter and mind. Finally, that, with the exception of such events as God renders dependent on the manner in which his rational creatures may exert their self-determining power, all others have been pre-ordained from all eternity; while even as regards events contingent on the created will, the contingencies themselves have been predetermined, all their possible issues foreseen, and the train of consequences to follow each issue not only foreseen, but provided for.

Thus, while the second supposition regards all events involving the actions of beings endowed with reason and free volition as contingent, and the first regards them as all predestined, excluding contingencies altogether, the third regards the general current of such events as falling out according to the operation of certain laws, but admits of exceptions to this rule, inasmuch as it views some issues as having been rendered by God himself dependent upon the determinations of his rational creatures.

For the sake of distinctness, the first of these three suppositions may be called the hypothesis of absolute predestination; the second, the hypothesis of fixed laws; and the third, the hypothesis of continuous direct interposition. They are all three more or less surrounded by difficulties, and the point to be determined is, which of the three presents the greatest facilities for the removal of those difficulties, and at the same time harmonizes to the greatest extent with the language and the general tenor and spirit of the sacred volume.

The chief advantage of the hypothesis of absolute predestination is the facility with which it appears to explain the prophecy of future events. It is easy to perceive that, if all events be predestined in an undeviating order of succession, they must be all of necessity foreknown to the Deity, and may therefore be prophesied by those to whom He communicates that foreknowledge; but it will afterwards be shewn that there is a class of prophecies of which this supposition does not afford any adequate explanation.

The following, again, are some of the difficulties surrounding this hypothesis:—

Firstly, It sets a limit to the exercise of the divine intellect ; for if the whole scheme of futurity be limited to a single line of events following each other in undeviating necessary sequence, the Deity, having once devised that scheme, has no other sphere of mental exertion left than quiescently to contemplate its evolution. Moreover, it is obviously a more limited exercise of mind to fix a single line of successive events, than to contrive an immense number of contingencies, and to foresee and provide for all their possible issues.

Secondly, It limits the power of God. It is clearly a much higher exercise both of power and wisdom to create intellectual beings with a freedom of volition of such a nature and extent, as to render a certain range of events dependent on the manner in which they exercise that power, than to create intelligent beings, whose freedom of will is so limited, in consequence of their every act of volition having been predetermined by their Creator, that no event in which they are concerned can possibly be contingent ; consequently the human mind can conceive of a higher degree of power and wisdom than that which this hypothesis assigns to the Deity.

Thirdly, It makes God to be the author of moral evil ; for if every event were predestined from all eternity, then God must have created certain beings for the express purpose of doing moral evil ; otherwise the evil which they have done could never have happened. Nor does it lessen this difficulty to say that the evil acts of such created beings were voluntary, because, according to the hypothesis, the manner in which they should exercise their will was predetermined by their Creator.

Fourthly, It confounds our notions of good and evil—right and wrong. What is good and right is, according to sound reason, what is conformable to the will and character of the Deity ; but if God have, from all eternity, predestined every act of evil committed by any of his creatures, as well as every act of good which they may have performed, it is plain that they who have done evil have acted in conformity with the predeterminate will of God, as much as they who have done good. Evil and good would thus be alike conformable to the will of God.

Fifthly, It subverts our ideas of the justice and goodness of

God; for if the evil done by his creatures were all predestined by the Creator himself, so that they were merely his willing instruments, carrying into effect his predeterminations, how can we reconcile the punishment of those creatures with our notions of justice? And if it be said that the punishment is merely the predestined consequence of the evil, how does the supposition of God's having created beings for no other end than to do evil and suffer punishment comport with our ideas of his benevolence?

Sixthly, It is subversive of the doctrine of divine providence; for if all events and circumstances fall out according to a fixed undeviating series, predestined from all eternity, there remains no necessity for any further interference on the part of the Deity, and providence becomes a superfluous hypothesis.

Seventhly, And what becomes of prayer under this supposition? Every prayer must be as much predestined as any other occurrence, and so must the result of every prayer; and what we, in our ignorance, may vainly imagine to be given in answer to our prayers, is truly only a part of the predetermined series of events.

Eighthly, But all these inevitable conclusions from this hypothesis are contradicted by the common sense of mankind; wherefore if the hypothesis be right, common sense must be wrong—an implanted deception; and how can this be, if the Deity be a God of truth?

Such are the difficulties which surround the hypothesis of absolute predestination. It remains to be ascertained what are the facilities it presents for their removal. The most formidable and fundamental of the objections which have been stated are the third and fourth; and it is accordingly to the removal of these, that the supporters of this hypothesis have chiefly directed their energies. The following are the chief arguments which have been employed for this purpose. It has been said that God may have predetermined things to happen, which are nevertheless in disconformity to his will. This, however, is only adding to the difficulty; because to suppose the Deity to have voluntarily predetermined that his creatures should act contrary to his will, is to make him the author of that contrariety; and

to suppose him to have predetermined it involuntarily, is to imagine the supreme will of the Deity to be subject to a still more supreme necessity.

Other defenders of this doctrine, seeing the impossibility of escaping from the conclusion to which it necessarily leads, that God must have primarily predetermined that moral evil should exist, endeavour to justify that conclusion by saying, that moral evil is acting contrary to God's revealed will, but not to his predetermine will. That God has revealed to the creature his character, and the manner in which the creature ought to act, in order to conform himself to that character ; but has concealed his secret purpose—his predetermination, according to which the creature must act. This, however, only introduces a new difficulty. It is to suppose God to have a double will, and to deal doubly by his creatures. It is to imagine that God's revealed will may differ from his secret will ; that he represents to the creature that he wishes him to act in accordance with the former, while the real truth may be that his secret will is that the creature shall do the very contrary. The hypothesis thus involves the idea, that the revealed will is a mere delusion, being in many cases contrary to the real will of the Deity, which is his secret purpose.

The following, however, is the most elaborate line of reasoning by which it has been attempted to escape from the difficulties attending this theory. It is argued that, as the Deity is all powerful, nothing in the universe can have power to defeat or counteract his purposes ; consequently, all things that are, including the existence of moral evil, must have entered into the great plan which He formed from the beginning. Why the divine decrees embraced moral evil as part of the scheme of the universe, or why that scheme is not more perfect than it is, we may not enquire. But from the very fact of its being as it is, we infer that it answers the purpose of the Creator. He did not choose it on account of its imperfections ; but those imperfections were not hidden from his view, nor are they independent of his will ; and he chose it out of all the possible worlds which He might have made, because, with all its imperfections, it promotes the end for which it was made. That

end, being such as God proposed, must be good ; and the world being the fittest to promote that end, must, notwithstanding its imperfections, be such as it was worthy of God to produce. With regard to the moral evil embraced in the general design, all that can be said of it is, that God's power was not exerted in hindering that from coming into existence which could not have existed independently of his will, and which is allowed to exist, because, although not of itself an object of his approbation, it results from something else.

There is in this argument, taken from the work of an able supporter of the hypothesis of absolute predestination, a curious admixture of truth and error. It is quite true that God is omnipotent ; but it is not a necessary consequence of this truth that no creature can act in opposition to his will or purpose. The very reverse conclusion may be drawn. God, in virtue of his omnipotence, may have created beings with such an amount of freedom of volition as to render it possible for them to oppose their will to his own. None but an omnipotent being could exercise so high a creative power ; so that the creation of such free agents would only be a display of omnipotence. His rendering it possible for them to oppose their wills to his own was not a surrender of his omnipotence ; because he may have prescribed certain limits beyond which they could not go ; and because, in using this freedom of volition, they would only be exercising a power which God had himself conferred.

It does not, therefore, of necessity follow that, because God is omnipotent, no creature can resist his will ; for the Deity may have so exercised his omnipotence as to have conferred on his intelligent creatures a power necessarily involving the *possibility* of their resisting his will within certain limits. Nay, the very essence of moral evil being the opposition of the will of the creature to that of the Creator, it does not appear possible that, unless such a power had been conferred on the creature, moral evil could have existed at all.

Neither does it follow, from the fact of God's having so constituted the mind of the creatures as to render it possible for them to act in opposition to his will, that he conferred that power with the express design that some of them should cer-

tainly oppose his will; for it is *à priori* equally probable that he conferred it with the design that they might, in exercising it, conform themselves to his will, actively and voluntarily, as free agents, and not merely of necessity and passively, as do those creatures who have no such power, but who are governed by the law of instinct. If the creatures do oppose the divine will then, they so far defeat the main purpose for which God conferred freedom of volition, namely, the happiness of the creature and the glory of the Creator.

But then God might have an alternative purpose, that in the event of their counteracting the former branch of the design, and so destroying their own happiness, the creatures should nevertheless subserve the latter. God might still cause their disobedience to contribute to the promotion of his own glory; so vindicating his omnipotence. God's primary intention, in conferring the power of free volition on his creatures, was doubtless that they might, in virtue of that freedom, voluntarily (not necessarily) conform themselves to the divine will; but as this freedom of necessity involved the possibility of their taking an opposite course, He further purposed that they should in that event be compelled to submit to another design—that of their being punished for their transgression.

Thus the assumption, that no creature has power to act contrary to the will and purpose of the Creator, is true in one sense, and not true in another. It is true that if the creatures do not willingly submit themselves to one design of God—that good design which He contemplated in conferring the gift of free volition, they must then of necessity submit to that alternative design which He has devised for the vindication of his omnipotent authority; so that the creatures cannot oppose their Creator with impunity. But it is not true that it is impossible to suppose Omnipotence to have conferred upon the creatures a power of choosing whether they shall obey or oppose the Creator's primary and good design—merely guarding his authority by the alternative vindictory design, of punishing those who should make a perverse use of their liberty. On the contrary, it appears to be of the essence of free volition, that it should involve the possibility of the will's opposing the very design for which it

was rendered free, and of the very essence of moral evil, that it should consist in opposition on the part of the creature to the good designs of the Creator.

Thus the basis of the argument in favour of the predestinarian method of accounting for the existence of moral evil is unsound ; for it assumes the very thing to be proved. It assumes that no created will can resist or oppose the good designs of the Creator : and that is not by any means a necessary deduction from the axiomatic truth that God is omnipotent.

The predestinarian argument goes on to state, that God made his design to embrace the necessary existence of moral evil ; because He considered such a constitution to be on the whole the best fitted to serve the ends He had in view. Here it is attempted to assign, as a reason for God's having made moral evil a necessary part of his design, simply that he saw fit to do so ; and truly this is the only reason that could have been assigned, had it been proved to be the fact, that God had made the necessary existence of moral evil an original element in his design. But this is the whole question, and the mere assertion that God might have seen fit to do so, will not prove that he actually did so, nor reconcile the mind to the incongruity involved in such a supposition. On the contrary, the mind cannot help perceiving it to be far more in accordance with its conceptions of the divine character to suppose that God might have seen fit to embrace in his design the existence of free agents, notwithstanding their freedom necessarily involved the *possibility*, that some might oppose their will to his own, but without decreeing that they should do so—his main design being that they should all act in conformity to his will. Because a system embracing creatures possessing free volition, even although it involved such a *possible* imperfection, was more glorious, more worthy of omnipotence, than an universe embracing nothing but passive instruments, creatures subject either to immutable and irresistible laws, or to equally immutable and irresistible decrees.

The difference between these two views is simply this. According to the predestinarian view, moral evil was a *necessary* element in the divine scheme, forming a part of the positive intention of the Creator. According to the other view, it was

only the *possibility* that moral evil might exist, that was a necessary element in the divine scheme ; and it was so by reason of its embracing free agents ; but it was not a part of the divine intentions that moral evil positively should exist ; the divine scheme was merely adapted to the foreseen possibility that it might exist.

The remaining part of the predestinarian account of the origin of moral evil is “ that God’s power was not exerted in hindering that from coming into existence which could not have existed independently of his will, and which is allowed to exist, because, although not in itself an object of his approbation, it results from something else.” Now this explanation is correct so far as it goes ; but it is the explanation which accords, not with the predestinarian notion, but with its opposite. It is quite true that moral evil must have arisen in consequence of God’s not having exercised his power to prevent it. He did not see fit to interfere with the freedom of volition, which He had given to the creatures, so as to prevent them from committing moral evil ; for that would have been at once to have destroyed the liberty he had conferred. But the evil could not have existed independently of his will ; because it could not have arisen unless he had given to his creatures that freedom of will in virtue of which it became possible for them to commit evil ; and He allows it to exist, because, although not in itself an object of his approbation, it results from something else. True, He allows it to exist, although it is the object of his hatred ; and that just because it results from something else than his positive decree that it should exist—namely, from the creature’s having devoted to a bad purpose a power conferred upon him for a good. But God’s merely refraining from putting forth his power to prevent the possibility of their committing evil is a very different thing from his having positively decreed that his creatures should commit evil ; and it is the latter view that is the necessary result of the doctrine of absolute predestination.

The answer to all these sophisms is contained in the three following abstract propositions, which have been already stated.

First. There must be a perfect agreement between the will

and the intentions or designs of the Deity. He cannot be supposed to decree or intend anything unwillingly.

Second. Moral evil being opposition to the divine will, must be also opposition to some good design or intention of the Deity.

Third. Consequently God cannot be supposed to have positively and primarily intended that moral evil should exist, for that is equivalent to saying that He intended opposition to his own intentions ; or that He made some of his creatures with the intention that they should not fulfil his intention in creating them ; both of which ideas are obviously absurd.

The hypothesis of fixed laws, while free from some of the objections to which that of absolute predestination is exposed, is open to others—as, for example, to this first objection, that it sets a limit to the exercise of the divine intellect. For if God have at first established certain fixed laws, by the operation of which all events whatever are determined, without any further interference on his part, it is plain that nothing remains for him but quiescently to contemplate the evolution of the limited number of contingencies depending on the operation of those laws.

Hence, secondly, it is subversive of the doctrine of divine providence, and renders prayer nugatory. For if all events fall out according to the operation of fixed laws, the necessity for the continued existence and superintendence of the Deity ceases. The laws of nature, once established, are of themselves sufficient for the government of the universe ; and it is vain for men to pray, seeing their prayers can never alter the operation of those fixed laws.

The chief advantage which the hypothesis of fixed laws possesses over that of absolute predestination is its apparently removing the difficulty with respect to the origin of moral evil ; for, by admitting the doctrine of contingencies, it seems to obviate the conclusion that God primarily intended that moral evil should exist. If these contingencies, however, be regulated by certain laws, and if moral evil be one of the necessary results of their operation, this circumstance would still throw back the origin of the evil upon the framer of the laws. If, again, the contingencies be not regulated by laws, but wholly determined

by the free volition of the creature, this would introduce a fresh difficulty in regard to the divine foreknowledge, and the prophecy of future events. For if it be the law of volition in created minds that they are, in all instances and under all circumstances, absolutely free to choose between moral good and moral evil, then the determination to be formed by any created mind would in every case be altogether uncertain—consequently all events having a necessary dependence on such determinations would partake of this perfect uncertainty. Hence, while all future events, depending for their evolution on the operation of the purely physical laws, would be absolutely certain, and so capable of being foretold with perfect precision; on the other hand, all events depending for their evolution on the determinations to be formed by created minds, would be absolutely uncertain, and so incapable of being either foreseen or foretold.

Thus the doctrine of fixed laws places the mind between the horns of a dilemma. If all the determinations of created minds be the results of fixed laws, and so absolutely certain, then there would be no difference between this doctrine and that of absolute predestination; and we must regard moral evil to be the necessary result of laws devised by the Divine Mind, consequently to form part of the original design of the Deity—a notion which has already been shewn to involve an absurdity.

On the other hand, if the fixed laws be of such a character as to render the determinations of all created minds absolutely uncertain, then all events depending on these determinations would in like manner be absolutely uncertain, so that the prophecy of them would be impossible.

But we do find in the Sacred Scriptures prophecies of events which involve the determinations of created minds; and it is, moreover, capable of proof, that many of these same prophecies have been historically fulfilled. Hence it follows that this second alternative cannot be correct, seeing it is contrary to the testimony alike of Scripture and of history.

It thus appears that the hypothesis of fixed laws does not afford a satisfactory explanation of the general principles of the divine government, but involves difficulties which seem incapable of being solved.

The hypothesis of direct interposition is free from the objections peculiar to those of absolute predestination and fixed laws. For 1st. It does not limit the exercise of the divine intellect, seeing it supposes it to be continually exerted in sustaining the various powers and properties with which God has endowed his creatures—in preserving in operation those laws to which He has subjected them, and in harmonizing those events which He sees fit to render contingent on the volitions of his creatures, with those others which He has predestined from all eternity.

2nd. It does not limit the power of God as regards the creation of voluntary agents ; because it supposes Him to have created beings on whom, although their volitions are usually regulated by certain laws, He has nevertheless conferred a self-determining power, which He occasionally calls into exercise, so as to constitute those creatures subordinate final causes, and so as to render a certain limited range of events dependent upon them as prime movers. This is the highest degree of self-determining power which it is possible to conceive any created being to possess ; for could any creature exercise such a power without the permission of the Creator, or were the range of contingencies depending on any created will not limited, such a creature would be independent of his Maker, and subject to no control. The existence of more than one absolute will in the universe is an impossibility. It is no limitation of divine power to say, that it is impossible for the mind to conceive of God's creating a duplicate of himself, which a being with a perfectly absolute will would be.

3rd. This hypothesis does not make the Deity to be the author of moral evil. It makes evil indeed to be one of the contingencies arising out of that degree of freedom of will which God saw fit to confer on his creatures, and which was such as to involve the possibility of their acting contrary to his will, and to the main design of their creation—such being the essence of all moral evil. This, however, makes the author of that evil to be not the Creator, but the creature, and is a very different thing indeed from the supposition that God created certain beings whom He had absolutely predestinated to commit evil. The latter notion makes the existence of moral evil to be the result

of a direct act of volition on the part of the Deity ; the other view makes its existence merely one of the foreseen contingencies which possibly might arise out of the creation of free-will agents.

4th. It does not confound our notions of good and evil : for if God did not absolutely predetermine that any of his creatures should positively commit evil, but merely endowed certain of them with such powers of volition that they might do either good or evil—that is, act either according to or contrary to the divine will, and to the primary intentions of the Deity in their creation, the distinction between these two, which by the first supposition is confounded, is by this hypothesis kept obvious and clear.

5th. It is nowise inconsistent with the divine benevolence to suppose God to have created beings with such a freedom of will that they might commit evil, seeing they were equally free to do good. It is moreover quite conformable to our notions of the divine justice to suppose the Deity to have attached reward to perseverance in well-doing, and punishment to the commission of evil, so as to create a strong bias in the minds of his creatures, to incite them to good by the hope of that reward, and to deter them from evil by the dread of that punishment.

6th. This hypothesis is in perfect accordance with the doctrine of Divine Providence ; because it assumes the necessity for the continued exercise of divine power in maintaining the operation of the laws of nature, and in so overruling the wills of the creatures, as to harmonize their acts with God's general designs.

7th. It places prayer on its proper footing, as an expression of a desire on the part of the creatures that their wills may be brought into conformity with the divine will—such being the true essence of prayer.

8th. It is nowise opposed to the common sense of mankind, and does not render that idea, which all entertain, that their conduct is, within certain limits, dependent on their wills, an innate deception ; it is therefore not inconsistent with God's truth.

While the hypothesis of direct interposition is thus free from the objections to which the other two are exposed, it is open to

others of a different kind; and it remains to be ascertained whether these be real or only apparent. The most obvious objection is that which arises out of the assumption of contingencies. The question at once suggests itself—is it possible to admit the existence of a contingency—that is, an event which depends for its happening on the will of the creature viewed as a subordinate final cause, consistently with the divine attributes? Were there but one will in the universe, that of the Deity, it would be impossible even to conceive of such a thing as a contingency; for all events would depend necessarily and immediately on that one will; and as there is in it no variableness, neither shadow of turning, an uncertainty would be an impossibility. The idea of a contingency, then, of necessity involves that of the existence of created minds—having conferred on them by their Creator a self-determining power of volition, which He allows them to exercise within certain limits, and at certain times, free from the restraint of any fixed laws; because such laws are merely the intentions or designs of the Deity; and were the self-determining power exercised only in the manner predetermined by the Deity, the events depending on its exercise would cease to be uncertain. In short, the self-determining power bestowed on the creature must, in order to there being any event dependent on it as a final cause, be of precisely the same nature as that possessed by the Deity himself—that self-determining power, in virtue of which He resolved to create the worlds; only in the case of the creature, the power cannot be exercised, except by the immediate permission of the Deity, and within the limits which He prescribes. Is it consistent then with the divine attributes to suppose God to have created such subordinate beings, with a self-determining power similar to his own?

The only attributes with which this supposition has an appearance of being inconsistent, are the divine omnipotence and omniscience. It may be asked, Is it not a limitation of the divine omnipotence to imagine that any created will can oppose the designs and intentions of the Deity? and is it not a limitation of the divine omniscience to imagine any event to be dependent on a self-determining power in the creatures as a final cause—

so rendering it an uncertainty, and removing it beyond the sphere of the certain foreknowledge of God?

As this is, without doubt, a formidable difficulty with which the doctrine of contingencies has to struggle, it is needful to approach it with due caution, and to probe the matter to the very foundation. Its solution involves, as a necessary element, the nature and origin of moral evil.

It has already been pointed out that there is such a necessary relation between the divine will and character, and the divine intentions and designs, that it is impossible to conceive of moral evil otherwise than as opposition, not only to the divine will and character, but also to some good design or intention of the Deity. Moreover, the laws of the universe being merely the designs and intentions of the Deity, moral evil must also be opposition to one or other of the laws of the universe.

Such being the nature of moral evil, it is impossible for us to conceive of it as having had its origin in the Divine Mind; and the only notion we can form on the subject is, that, if such a thing as moral evil exist at all, it must have arisen from the opposition of the will of some other mind to the will and intentions or laws of the Deity. Again, since God is the only self-existent Being, and the Author of all being, if there exist a mind having a will opposed to that of the Deity, it must be a mind created by God himself. But in order that the will of any created mind might become thus opposed to the divine will and intentions, God must have conferred upon it a power to become so, and He must have conferred that power for a different purpose; because it is only by the created mind's exercising this power in a manner different from that in which God designed that it should be exercised, that the created will can oppose itself to the divine intentions.

The very fact, then, that there do exist in the universe minds whose wills are opposed to the divine will, is a proof that the Deity must have conferred on some created mind, for some good purpose, a power which the creature has diverted to an opposite purpose. Now, from certain statements contained in the Sacred Scriptures, it may be gathered that this opposition to the divine will was originated by a powerful and highly intelligent created

being. Whether this particular inference be admitted or not, it is plain that there must have been a first act of moral evil, and that such first act must have had its origin in some created mind. The Deity then must have conferred on that mind such an amount of self-determining power as to render it possible for it either voluntarily to conform to the divine intentions, or voluntarily to oppose them; and the former must have been the primary purpose for which God conferred that power. For to suppose the Deity to have given the originator of moral evil a power, with the intention that he should use it for a purpose opposite to that which God intended, is a plain contradiction in terms.

It hence appears quite necessary to grant that God must have created the mind of the originator of moral evil with a self-determining power, intending and wishing that he should voluntarily conform his determinations to the will of his Creator; and, further, that God did not decree either that the creature should fulfil this design, or that he should not; for had the Creator decreed that the creature should fulfil the design of his creation, that would have been to subject the created will to a necessary law, and would have deprived any submission that might have been rendered of its peculiar character of a voluntary, as contradistinguished from an instinctive or necessary obedience. On the other hand, to suppose the Deity to have decreed that the originator of moral evil should use his conferred self-determining power for a purpose contrary to that for which it had been bestowed, would be to suppose God to decree oppositely from what He intends.

Thus the existence of a being endowed with a self-determining power, which he, as a final cause, may exercise within certain limits, free from the restraint of any law or divine predetermination, obviously involves, as a necessary consequence, the possibility of his exercising that power either in conformity with the purpose for which God conferred it, or in opposition to that purpose. Now, it is not thinking unworthily of the Deity to suppose Him to have created a being with such a power. The act was an exercise of omnipotence, and the design was one of benevolence. It was an act of infinite wisdom, and calculated to redound to

the glory of the Creator ; for the voluntary obedience of such a creature would have been far more glorious than the instinctive submission of thousands of creatures so constituted as to exclude the possibility of their opposing their wills to that of their Creator. The control which God retained, moreover, in reserving to Himself the power of punishing the creature, in the event of his thwarting the primary benevolent design for which he had been created, was a sufficient assertion of supreme authority over him.

It having been shewn that the originator of moral evil must have been created with a self-determining power, conferred on him for the purpose of his rendering a voluntary and rational, but not instinctive obedience to his Creator, which power necessarily involved the possibility of his applying it to an opposite purpose, it follows that there must have been a probability that he would adopt the former, and a probability that he would adopt the latter course, which two probabilities must have borne to each other a certain ratio. We cannot suppose the latter probability to have been stronger than the former, because that would be to imagine God to have held out some inducement to his creatures to thwart his own designs—an idea altogether inconsistent with our conceptions of the divine character. The highest ratio, then, that we can assign to the adverse probability is one of equality with that to which it was opposed. Looking to the benevolence of the Deity, however, it appears reasonable to suppose that God did not leave these two probabilities even in a state of equality, but that He held out some positive and powerful inducement to the created mind to act in conformity to the primary benignant design for which it was created, and thus gave a strong preponderance to the probability that it would so act.

It may be presumed, moreover, that this preponderance was carried as far as was consistent with the existence of the self-determining power. Analogy favours this view, and leads to the inference that the preponderance was given by the hope of reward and the fear of punishment ; for it would not be conformable to our conceptions of the character of the Deity to suppose Him to have dispensed with these important sanctions to the commands which He might see fit to impose on his rational creatures, with

a view to the trial of their obedience. Such hopes and fears would doubtless produce a certain bias in the created mind towards fulfilment of the primary intentions of God, and would, in all likelihood, give a very decided preponderance to the probability of its adopting that course rather than the opposite; but what might be the actual ratio between the two probabilities thus constituted could be known to God alone. Whatever it may have been, it is impossible for us to imagine the Deity to have viewed these two otherwise than as probabilities, standing to each other in that ratio, seeing He had Himself so constituted them.

Accordingly, to say that God either absolutely foreknew or absolutely predetermined that one of these probabilities should be a positive certainty, or rather made it so from the beginning, involves a contradiction. It is, moreover, either to deny to God the power of rendering anything future a mere possibility, or to suppose Him to have foreknown that to be certain which He had Himself rendered only possible. Between these two conclusions there is no alternative. We must either deny to Omnipotence the ability to create a subordinate being with a self-determining power, such as to render his determinations merely probable in a certain ratio; or we must admit that there may exist a contingency, the issue of which is, by the very constitution which God has given to it, incapable of being foreknown otherwise than as a possibility. Thus it will be perceived that, in order to avoid the supposition of God's having decreed a contradiction, or having primarily intended opposition to his own intentions, it is quite necessary to admit that He decrees probabilities, and thus voluntarily sets a limit to the certainty of his own foreknowledge.

It will be observed, then, that this limit does not arise out of anything in the creature independently of his Creator, but is the necessary consequence of a power conferred by the Deity Himself, the power and its consequence being so linked together that the one could not exist without the other. If the Deity then saw it to be good, and becoming his own glory and character, to confer such a power on the creature, He must also have seen it to be good, and not derogatory to his wisdom, nor inconsistent with his character, to set this limit to the extent of his own absolute foreknowledge, and it does not become us to say that it

is impossible for Him to have so exercised his creative power, as to involve the necessity of such a limit.

But to what does this limit amount after all? If God know everything knowable, He is still omniscient. If He see fit, in the exercise of his omnipotence, so to arrange the scheme of his government as to render certain issues mere probabilities, without elevating them by his decree into the rank of certainties, that surely does not diminish his omniscience. It is a mere refraining from the exercise of a power of selection, and the issues continue to be known in their true character as mere probabilities until one of them emerge. The inconsistency, then, of contingencies with the divine attribute of omniscience is only apparent, for the divine knowledge does really embrace them in their true character. God must know all possible events, but those only can be viewed by Him as certain which He has Himself rendered certain, while those which He has rendered contingent He can view only as contingent.

The further consideration of the general principles of the divine government of the moral universe thus resolves itself into an examination of this question, Whether is it easier for the human mind to conceive of God's having created the first transgressor of his moral law with the positive design and intention that he should act in opposition to his Creator's will, or of God's having created him with a power which He wished and intended him to use in one way, but which power necessarily involved the possibility of his using it in a contrary way, thus setting a necessary limit to the absoluteness of the divine foreknowledge? Which of these views is most consonant to a reasonable idea of the divine character and perfections? From this alternative there is no escape.

Now, the only reason that can be assigned for adopting the former view is the notion that an omniscient and omnipotent Being cannot regard anything future as uncertain. It is only because the mind fancies God to have had a certain foreknowledge of the existence of moral evil that it imagines Him to have predetermined that it should certainly exist. But the idea that God primarily intended the existence of moral evil involves the palpable contradiction that God, when He created the first trans-

gressor of his moral law, predetermined that he should act contrary to the design for which he was created, for his so acting is what constitutes his transgression. The mind, however, finds it impossible to conceive of the Deity as thus contradicting Himself, consequently the premises which lead to this absurd conclusion must be fallacious; there must be something wrong in the idea that an omniscient and omnipotent Being cannot regard anything future otherwise than as certain.

On the other hand, the mind has no difficulty in conceiving of an omnipotent, omniscient, and good Being as having conferred on his creature, for a benevolent end, a power of such a nature as of necessity to involve the mere possibility of the creature's perverting it to an opposite purpose. Neither does the mind perceive any incongruity in supposing the Creator to have refrained from predetermining that the creature should exercise this power either in the one way or the other. On the contrary, it would violate the mind's conceptions of the divine benevolence and consistency to suppose God to have predetermined that the creature should exercise this power in opposition to the good design for which it had been conferred. But if the mind be thus driven to the conclusion that God did not predetermine in what manner the creature should exercise the power, it cannot escape from admitting the necessity of the further conclusion that God thus originated two opposite possibilities, and a consequent necessary limit to the certainty of his own foreknowledge. The human understanding is thus compelled to abandon as untenable the notion, that an omnipotent and omniscient Being cannot regard futurities as mere possibilities.

That anything may be the subject of foreknowledge, it must, as already pointed out, have some sort of existence—it must pre-exist as an intention, either in the Divine Mind or in the created mind. If moral evil pre-existed either from the first as an intention in the Divine Mind, or if it subsequently pre-existed as an intention in the created mind, it would be capable of being certainly foreknown, but not otherwise. Its pre-existence as an intention in the created mind, however, involves of necessity its pre-existence from the first as an intention in the Divine Mind; because it could not thus pre-exist in the created mind without

the Creator's so intending. Hence, seeing it cannot have pre-existed as an intention in the Divine Mind without involving a contradiction, so neither can it have pre-existed in the created mind without a similar result; indeed, the existence in the created mind of an intention to do evil is itself moral evil. Thus it being impossible to suppose moral evil to have pre-existed as an intention, either in the creating or the created mind, it wanted the necessary element of existence to render it capable of being foreknown as a certainty. It could be foreknown only as a possible result of the freedom of volition imparted to the created mind.

In choosing between these two views, then, the mind will naturally prefer that of which it can conceive to that of which it cannot conceive; it will cling to that view which allows it to regard the Deity as not less good, not less wise, not less powerful, and not less omniscient, because of his having created a being capable of acting in opposition to the benevolent purpose for which he was created, and who has so acted. It will prefer such a view to that other which compels it to imagine moral evil to be part of the original design of the Creator—to suppose God to have from the first intended his creatures to act in opposition to his will, so making his intention to have been primarily opposed to his own will; in other words, making God the author, not only of moral evil, but also of a contradiction. Between these two views there is no alternative; for to affirm, as some have alleged, that the Deity certainly foreknew that the originator of moral evil would oppose the design for which he had been created, without having predetermined that he should so act, involves one of two impossible conclusions—either that God foreknew that as certain which He Himself had rendered only possible; or that God, in creating the originator of moral evil, foreknew that he would certainly oppose the purpose for which he was created, but was nevertheless under the necessity of bringing him into existence.

It may be argued that the view which regards the existence of moral evil as having been originally a mere possibility, only removes the difficulty a step further back, but does not solve it; that there can be no effect without a cause, and that there must have been some reason why the first transgressor of God's moral

law acted in opposition to the design for which he was created. True, but the cause was simply the transgressor's own self-determining power of volition acting as a prime mover or final cause; and we can no more assign a reason why the first transgressor exercised this power in a manner opposed to that in which the Deity intended him to use it, than we can assign a reason why God, in the exercise of his own self-determining power, chose to create mankind. Both are ultimate facts beyond which reason cannot penetrate. But in the case of the first transgressor the question may be answered negatively, and the mind finds it impossible to escape the conviction that the reason of his opposing the divine intentions was neither that God primarily intended him so to act, nor that God was under the necessity of creating him, notwithstanding his having the certain foreknowledge, that his creature would defeat the primary end of his creation.

By adopting this view the human understanding is enabled to comprehend how God has overruled the self-will, and consequent moral evil, of his creatures for the promotion of his own glory. For the existence of moral evil in the universe thus becomes the strongest possible proof of the infinite goodness, wisdom, and power of the Deity. None but an infinitely good, wise, and powerful Being could have created a subordinate being, with an immense amount of intellectual capacity and a perfectly free will—so free that it could oppose itself to the will of its Creator; and nothing could so plainly demonstrate that the Deity did exercise so high an amount of creative power, and did confer on some of his creatures so perfect a moral freedom, as the fact that a portion of these creatures have actually so abused their liberty, as to have opposed their wills to that of their Creator.

The foregoing argument applies to that created mind in which the first transgression of God's moral law had its origin. The case of the human mind is somewhat more complicated, and requires to be separately considered. The question at present under discussion is the abstract possibility of God's creating a contingency, and the argument has gone no further than to prove that we must either admit his having done so, or hold the existence of opposition to his will to have been part of his original design—a notion involving an obvious contradiction.

But while admitting that there is a necessary limit to the absoluteness of the divine foreknowledge involved in the supposition of moral evil's having had its origin solely in the created mind, acting as a final cause, this limitation must not be carried one step beyond the point to which it has been carried by the Deity Himself—namely, to that point which is necessary to throw the origin of moral evil exclusively upon the creature, and to render it not only no part of the primary design of the Creator, but an absolute opposition by the creature to that design—an opposition arising out of the perverse exercise of a power conferred by God for a different and benevolent end. We must never for a moment suppose this opposition to have taken the Deity by surprise—to have been a thing of which He did not contemplate the possibility, and for which He was consequently quite unprepared. The theory which has been advocated amounts to no more than the conceiving God to have established two possibilities, standing to each other in a certain ratio of probability, and which must consequently have been viewed by the Divine Mind in that ratio, both being foreseen and both provided for. No further assumption is made than that God did not choose which of these possibilities should happen, but left that choice entirely to the created mind as a subordinate final cause.

This idea of God's establishing opposite possibilities opens a new and separate question, which has an important bearing on the theory of the divine government. It is this: If in the case of the numerous intelligent beings whom God created, and on whom he conferred a self-determining power, the two possibilities that they would exercise that power either in accordance with or in opposition to the design for which it was conferred, stood to each other in a certain ratio of probability—would that ratio continue the same for ever, and would the aggregate of all the probabilities be the same as in the case of each individual? In order to the solution of this difficulty, it must be kept in mind that while the hypothesis of direct interposition assumes the existence of a self-determining power in the creature, it does not assume the continued and unrestrained exercise of that power. On the contrary, it supposes all created wills to be, in their

normal state, subject to certain laws, by which they are kept in one uniform course of action, and that it is only when the Deity overrules the operation of those laws, and for some special purpose calls into exercise the self-determining power of the creature as a final cause, that any event becomes contingent on the created will. This interference of the Deity with the operation of the normal laws, by which He governs his intelligent creatures, is denominated in Scripture his *trying* them. Now we cannot conceive of such a trial otherwise than as necessarily involving an alternative. God tries whether his creatures will render Him a voluntary obedience, or no ; and with that view He calls into exercise their self-determining power, so freeing them, as respects the subject of their trial, from the operation of the normal laws, thus establishing two opposite possibilities as regards the issue. But God does not always try his creatures in this manner, and when He does not, they remain under the normal laws.

Now if any creatures have been thus tried, and have rendered a voluntary submission to such an extent as God approves, then He may cease from trying them, and, as the reward of their submission, place them in such circumstances as to be no longer in danger of acting contrary to his will. This is quite conceivable, for one of the laws to which the creature is subject is that of habit. God has so constituted his intelligent creatures that they relish that to which they have become accustomed, and persevere with pleasure in those courses of action which they have maintained for a length of time. Those created minds, then, which, on being subjected to trial, yielded a voluntary submission to their Creator, would, in virtue of this law, gradually acquire a liking to this voluntary obedience, by reason of the pleasure experienced in rendering it, their wills would receive a bias in that direction, so that the probability of their continuing in obedience would be continually gaining an ascendancy over its opposite, until the latter would entirely vanish. This may be supposed to be the condition of those angels “ who do God’s commandments, hearkening to the voice of his word.” The Scriptures indicate that they, too, had their period of trial, but that, on being tried, they acted in conformity with the divine will, that they are no longer exposed to such trial, but

that, under the operation of the law of habit, it is now their delight to fulfil God's will. Thus we see that, in this case, the probabilities, whatever may have been their original ratio, are, by the operation of this law of habit,—that is, by the design of the Deity—subsequently brought into such a state of extreme inequality that the adverse probability may be held to have vanished.

If we take the reverse case, that of the creature's disobedience on being subjected to trial, it would appear that, in consequence of its fall, the created mind becomes subject to laws different from those which influenced the unfallen will. In other words, the divine intentions with respect to the fallen differ from what they are with respect to the unfallen. The former, by their fall, entirely evert the original ratio of probabilities; and unless God see fit to subject them to some new trial, and open to them some way of recovery, the operation of the law appears to be such that they continue in their disobedience, become more and more opposed to the divine character, and having failed to render a willing obedience to God's benevolent intentions, they are compelled to submit to his penal designs.' The law of habit, too, operates in this case as in the other, and once they have become accustomed to do moral evil, the creatures cannot escape from the operation of that law, unless God himself interpose in their behalf. The original ratio of the probabilities, therefore, cannot in any case subsist beyond the first trial; for its result must be to give one of them a preponderance over the other more or less complete.

It may here be asked, could not God have created his intelligent creatures originally, with their wills in that same condition of harmony with their duty, which has been attributed to the operation of habit, and so have excluded the possibility of the rise of moral evil in his universe? True, this might have been; but had the will of the creature been thus originally constituted in a state of necessary harmony with the divine intentions, all intelligent creatures would have been under the law of instinct. The ant and the bee voluntarily fulfil the divine intentions in virtue of that law; but theirs is a much lower species of obedience than what may be rendered by creatures endowed with a self-determining power, and who, in virtue of that power, may either

obey or disobey ; while it cannot be doubted that those creatures who render this latter species of obedience, may attain to a much higher degree of happiness than those who obey from mere instinct. Now, God may regard the universe as more glorious, more worthy of his wisdom and omnipotence, by reason of its embracing myriads of intelligent creatures, endowed with a self-determining power, and who have, on being tried, rendered him a voluntary obedience, than it would have been had it contained only such creatures as are subject to the law of instinct. And this, notwithstanding the more glorious end has been attained at the expense of the existence of moral evil, arising through the disobedience of some. And the divine scheme is all the more glorious, and all the more worthy of God, because the existence of moral evil was not a necessary or inherent blemish in it, but merely a foreseen possibility—yet a possibility necessarily involved in the primary design, which the Divine Mind had in contemplation.

But it may still be asked, does not the law of habit ultimately bring about precisely the same result as might have been first attained by the law of instinct—namely, a harmony between the created will and the divine intentions? Doubtless, as respects the mere concord between the creating and created wills, the ends are the same ; but surely this harmony, when established after repeated trials in a mind endowed with a self-determining power, is more glorious to God than when it exists innate in beings possessing no such power. It is easy to see, moreover, that an innate harmony between the created will and the divine intentions would have been incompatible with the free exercise of a self-determining power ; whereas there is no such incompatibility, when the harmony is a result flowing from the continued exercise of such a power in one direction ; for the free exercise of the power is in that case necessary to the attainment of the end.

There remains this other and more difficult question. Supposing that, in the case of each individual, the possibilities of obedience and disobedience originally stood to each other in a certain ratio of probability, what would be the aggregate of all those probabilities ? Would not the probability that some would disobey be much greater than either that of universal obedience or

that of universal disobedience ; and would not this preponderance continually increase with the number of the beings on whose self-determining power the issue depended ; and might not the number of beings be so great as to make that preponderance almost infinite, and so render it next to certain, if not absolutely certain, that some would disobey ? And does not this law thus lead to the necessary conclusion that, without absolutely designing that moral evil should exist, or predetermining what individual beings should disobey, God might certainly foreknow that moral evil should arise ?

In answering these questions it must be kept in view that, if such a law applied, it could have done so only by the intention of the Deity. If it be true that, when the number of free and intelligent beings is very great, the probability of their all rendering obedience to their Creator becomes very small, it must have been the intention of the Creator that it should so be ; consequently it would follow that God must have primarily designed that moral evil should arise—that is, have intended opposition to his own intentions, a contradiction which has been shewn to be impossible. If it be imagined again that this law of probabilities was not itself a part of the divine intentions, but was a necessary consequence of the existence of the self-determining power conferred on the creatures ; if it be alleged that it was the necessary result of the existence of such creatures, that the more they were multiplied, the greater became the certainty that some of them would act in opposition to the divine intentions, this would simply be to render the certainty of opposition to the divine intentions a necessary element in the carrying out of those purposes—thus subjecting God to a necessity ; whereas the only real necessity involved in his designs was the mere possibility of opposition to his will.

On closer examination, however, it will be found that the probabilities could not follow the law which is here supposed ; for the probability that some would disobey is imagined to increase, while the ratio between the probabilities of obedience and disobedience in each individual remains unchanged. It is plain, however, that nothing could affect the original ratio in the case of each individual, except some circumstance having a tendency

to influence the individual mind, either towards obedience or disobedience. ' Now while it might be granted that the fall of one being might increase the probability of the fall of others, by reason of the influence which one mind might exert over another ; yet it is plain that, as regards the first tendency to moral evil, this could not be augmented in any individual mind by the mere increase in the number of beings. There is no ground for supposing that the existence of a thousand millions of beings could operate as a greater moral inducement to any one being to oppose the divine will than would the existence of only one million ; or that the inducement would be multiplied a hundredfold by merely increasing the numbers in that proportion. The original ratio, therefore, of the probabilities of the obedience or disobedience of each individual could not be effected by the mere increase of numbers. Such, however, would be the necessary result, were it true that the probability of the disobedience of some continually increased with the number of beings ; for there would then be a certain amount which would render the probability of the disobedience of one extremely great ; and were that amount increased a thousandfold, the probability of the disobedience of a thousand individuals would become extremely great ; and thus, by the mere multiplication of numbers, a thousand individuals would have the original ratio of the probability of their obedience or disobedience completely overturned ; for their disobedience would become next to certain ; whereas, had only one thousand been created, the probability of their obedience would have preponderated.

The moral determinations of free-will agents are thus altogether distinct from ordinary chances, which are subject to this numerical law ; for by the very hypothesis, such moral agents are a law unto themselves, and totally free from the restraints of any other law whatever in the exercise of their self-determining power. This freedom they could not possess were they subject to the same law of probability as are ordinary chances.

It will thus be seen that the mere multiplication of numbers could not have the effect of rendering it more probable that some would disobey without overturning the ratio of probabilities in the case of individuals, which it has no moral tendency to do.

We could not embrace this view, moreover, without arriving at the conclusion that God might, in creating, have stopped short of the number which rendered the introduction of moral evil certain, and that it had its origin in the mere circumstance of his having created such a multitude of beings. This conclusion, however, is altogether untenable; for the Deity must have known that such would be the necessary effect of his so multiplying his creatures; and his creating so great a number would shew that He intended to cause opposition to his own intentions; which is absurd.

An apparent objection to the admission of contingencies depending on the free exercise of created wills arises out of its seeming inconsistency with prophecy. It may be asked, if future events be to any extent contingent on the created will as a first cause, how can they be foretold? It will be remembered, however, that the hypothesis of direct interposition, while recognizing contingencies, yet regards all creatures endowed with free volition as usually acting under the influence of certain mental laws—their thoughts and actions being, on a general view, the result of the operation of those laws; and seeing the laws themselves are the designs of the Deity, the larger portion of the actions of rational beings are just what God designed they should be; they are predestinated in virtue of the laws by which they are regulated; consequently, the Deity knowing his own intentions, and the manner of operation of the laws by which the mental acts of his creatures are governed, must foreknow as certainties all those actions which they perform under the operation of those laws. Such actions may accordingly become the subject of prophecy in the mouth of those to whom God may see fit to communicate that foreknowledge.

As regards those actions of rational creatures, then, which result from the operation of laws, the hypothesis of direct interposition adequately accounts for the manner in which they may become the subject of prophecy. But then, in order to escape from the incongruity of imagining the Deity to have positively predetermined that moral evil should exist, the hypothesis of direct interposition admits that God overrules the operation of the normal laws; and for the purpose of trying his creatures,

frees them as respects certain limited issues from the influence of those laws—thus leaving such issues to depend upon the self-determining power of the creature. It has been shewn, moreover, that this supposition of necessity involves the idea that, as regards those issues, the Deity sets a limit to the certainty of his own foreknowledge; consequently such issues, if made the subject of prophecy at all, must be prophesied of as contingencies. The question then arises—have we any examples of this species of prophecy? Are there in the Scriptures any prophecies concerning contingent events; or are there any facts narrated in the sacred volume, or expressions there used, which necessarily imply the existence of such contingent issues? This is the true touchstone of the accordance with Scripture of this branch of the hypothesis of direct interposition, and it therefore requires a particular examination.

There is a well-known Scriptural narrative, which has very much the appearance of recognizing this species of contingent issue as the subject of prophecy, while nevertheless its doing so is not absolutely certain. When David was shut up in Keilah, having heard that Saul was about to come down to attack him, he inquired of the Divine oracle, “Will Saul come down to Keilah, and will the men of Keilah deliver me into his hand?” The answer was, “He will come down, and they will deliver thee up.” But David, profiting by this intimation, left Keilah, and Saul did not go down. Saul’s conduct and that of the men of Keilah were both contingent on David’s stay in the place. They were prophesied of as such, and the antecedent having been changed in consequence of that prophecy, other equally foreseen contingencies fell out in their stead. It must be admitted, however, that the oracular response in this case may be differently explained; for notwithstanding it appears to convey a positive intimation that Saul would certainly go down to Keilah, and that its inhabitants would certainly deliver David into his hand, the impression which it conveyed to David may have been simply that there existed in the mind of Saul an already formed intention to go down to the city, and that there existed in the minds of its chief citizens an already formed intention to deliver David into his hands.

The instance next to be cited, however, does not admit of such an explanation ; for it involves the intentions not of man, but of the Deity himself. It is the very remarkable case of the sickness and recovery of Hezekiah, which is twice narrated in the Scriptures in precisely the same terms, so that there can be no doubt about the accuracy of the details.

Hezekiah having fallen sick, the prophet Isaiah came to him with the following announcement. "Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die and not live." It is impossible to conceive such a message as this, coming from the God of truth, to have been a mere deception intended to try Hezekiah—to alarm his fears, with the view of leading him to pray that his life might be prolonged, in order that its extension for fifteen years, which it was all along the intention of the Deity to grant, might have the appearance of being accorded in answer to his prayer. Such a supposition is too monstrous ; yet it is one from which it is impossible to escape, on the assumption that the extension of his life was absolutely determined on from the first. But the solution of the difficulty becomes quite simple, if it be granted that both his immediate death, and the prolongation of his life for fifteen years, were alike predestined and foreseen as contingencies, the former to emerge in the event of his disregarding or disbelieving the announcement of the prophet, the latter, in the event of his earnestly praying for recovery ; his choice in the matter having been left absolutely free. And what stronger instance can be adduced of the fact that God does actively interpose in the course of events, and with a view to the establishment of special contingencies and controlling their issues, renders all the powers and laws of nature obedient to his immediate volition ? For here the progress of a deadly disease was stayed, and for a sign the shadow was brought back on a particular sun-dial, the laws of nature being, in both instances, not broken, but so overruled as to satisfy man that God truly is the hearer and answerer of prayer.

There is a narrative which some have regarded as bearing a considerable parallelism to this of Hezekiah, and as in some degree explanatory of it. Benhadad, king of Syria, being sick, sent Hazael to Elisha to inquire whether he should recover. The answer of the prophet, as given in the authorized transla-

tion is, "Go, say unto him, Thou mayest certainly recover; howbeit the Lord hath shewed me that he shall surely die." Even if we adopt this reading, there is no such resemblance between this message and that delivered to Hezekiah, as to render the two cases parallel. But some editions of the Hebrew Scriptures have in this passage a different reading, which would make the answer of Elisha run thus, "Go, say not, Thou shalt surely live; for the Lord hath shewed me that he shall surely die." Were the other reading followed, however, it should be understood as importing not that Elisha authorized Hazael to deliver a false message to his master, but merely that he intimated his foreknowledge that Hazael would say to his master, "Thou shalt surely live;" and would thereafter falsify his words by putting him to death. The imperative mood is in the Hebrew idiom not unfrequently used, for the purpose of giving greater force to the expression, instead of the future tense, and in such cases the latter should be employed in the translation. Thus, in this passage, the rendering might be, "Go, thou wilt say unto him, Thou mayst surely live, but the Lord hath shewed me that he shall surely die."

The case of the Ninevites is more exactly parallel to that of Hezekiah. The destruction of their city was a predestined contingency, and as such Jonah was commanded to foretell it. There was another contingency, however, equally predestined—that if the Ninevites should repent their city should be spared; but of this Jonah was not informed. They did repent—their city was spared; and the event prophesied by Jonah, much to his surprise, did not take place. His prophecy, however, was not the less a true one—a veritable declaration of the divine intentions, and the contingency which he foretold would certainly have fallen out had the Ninevites not repented. But, it may be asked, must not God have certainly foreknown that the Ninevites would repent? The reply to this objection is that their repentance was truly a contingency; and, therefore, to suppose the Deity to have foreknown it otherwise than as a contingency—to have foreknown it as a certainty—is to suppose that He foreknew it to be something different from what it really was, according to the constitution assigned to it by God Himself.

We have a remarkable instance of the recognition of contingencies in the language of the divine commission to Moses (Exod. iv. 8, 9). "And it shall come to pass, if they will not believe thee, neither hearken to the voice of the first sign, that they will believe the voice of the latter sign. And it shall come to pass, if they will not believe also these two signs, neither hearken unto thy voice, that thou shalt take of the water of the river, and pour it upon the dry land; and the water which thou takest out of the river shall become blood upon the dry land." It is plain from the phraseology here employed that the Deity is represented as viewing, in the light of a contingency, the belief of the Israelites in the various signs which He instructed Moses to exhibit to them. The true sense of the passage, however, is scarcely well brought out in our translation of the first clause, which should be rendered thus:—"And it shall come to pass, if they will not believe thee, neither hearken to the voice of the first sign, that they may believe the voice of the latter." That this is the true meaning is evident from the sequel.

There is a similar recognition of a contingency in the language of our Saviour when instructing his disciples to bring the ass-colt on which he intended to ride into Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. 2, 3). He says, "Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her: loose them, and bring them unto me. And if any man say aught unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them, and straightway he will send them." Here it will be observed that Christ speaks of the colt's being found by his disciples as a certainty, but of their being asked why they loosed him as a contingency.

It is unnecessary to cite more than one other example, but it is a very remarkable one, throwing a peculiar light on the doctrine and nature of contingencies, as also on the hypothesis of direct divine interposition. When the children of Israel made the golden calf, while Moses was in the mount, the Lord, after informing him of the fact, said to him, "I have seen this people, and, behold, they are a stiffnecked people. Now, therefore, let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation." A second time, when the people became enraged against Caleb and

Joshua, who reported favourably of the promised land, the Lord said to Moses, "How long will this people provoke me, and how long will it be ere they believe me, for all the signs which I have shewed among them? I will smite them with the pestilence and disinherit them, and will make of thee a greater nation, and a mightier than they." On both occasions Moses deprecated the divine displeasure, entreating God to forgive his people; and the Lord, yielding to his intercession, forgave them for his sake. Now, to suppose the intention which God thus intimated to Moses to have been no intention at all, but an empty threat and a vain promise, uttered merely to frighten the Israelites and try Moses, is an idea too monstrous and too repugnant to an intelligent conception of the divine character to be entertained for a moment. If the Eternal be the God of truth, and if these passages contain a correct report of the communications which He made to Moses, there must have existed in the Divine Mind a real design to disinherit the general body of the people of Israel, and to raise up a new nation from the family of Moses; but this intention was never carried into effect. What, then, was it, if not a contingency? The Deity foresaw the probability of Israel's becoming incorrigibly rebellious, and He had predestined a remedy. He resolved in that event to disinherit them, and make of Moses a new nation, greater and mightier than they, thus shewing that He would not permit their perversity to frustrate his general designs. He accepts, however, the intercession of Moses. He adopts another alternative, equally predestined and foreseen. He postpones the entry of the Israelites into the promised land until the whole of the rebellious generation had died in the wilderness.

To this view it may be objected that it infers a changeability in the designs of the Deity; but, if closely examined, it will be found to be quite the reverse. The general design was to give the land of promise to a nation composed of the descendants of Jacob, but the Deity did not limit Himself to one method of accomplishing this design. To doubt that one of the modes in which He contemplated carrying it out was that of raising up a fresh race in the person of Moses, should the rest of the descendants of Israel, by their disobedience, provoke Him to disinherit

them, is to doubt the veracity of the narrative. His having predestined more than one mode of carrying out a general design infers no changeability in God, but merely indicates the manner in which He harmonizes the fixedness of his own general purposes with that degree of freedom of will which He has given to his creatures, and which renders it possible that their wills may become opposed to his own.

It thus appears that there is in the Scriptures sufficient warrant for holding that they represent the Deity as rendering certain events contingent on the manner in which his creatures may exercise that degree of freedom which he accords to their wills ; that thus far, therefore, the hypothesis of direct interposition has, in this important particular, the support of Scripture ; and that, instead of its being inconsistent with prophecy, there are prophecies which can be explained by that hypothesis alone.

On comparing the three hypotheses whose merits have been examined, it will be perceived that, while that of absolute predestination involves the insurmountable difficulty of attributing to God a positive intention that moral evil should exist, and while the hypothesis of fixed laws, by making contingency the law of all events in which free agents are concerned, excludes the whole of such events from the certain foreknowledge of the Deity ; the hypothesis of direct interposition throws the origin of moral evil entirely on the creature, reduces the greater number of the actions of free-will agents under the dominion of laws, but recognizes as an endowment of the intelligent creature a self-determining power, on which the Deity Himself renders a limited range of events contingent, so excluding them from his own foreknowledge except as contingencies. This last hypothesis accordingly does not involve any difficulties which can be regarded as wholly insurmountable, seeing they are capable of explanations which do not violate any of those first principles which form the basis of all reasonable conceptions of the divine nature and character. According to the rules of the method of exhaustion, then, it falls to be preferred.

M. P.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We wish our readers to understand that we cannot be held responsible for the opinions of our contributors and correspondents. The utmost we can do is to keep a careful eye upon the literary character of their communications, and to see that they do not transcend the limits of fair criticism and lawful inquiry.]

“MESSIAH THE PRINCE.”

ONE of your correspondents, who subscribes himself G. B., in your last Journal, has drawn attention to a work entitled “*Messiah the Prince*,” in which the author, in the course of his remarks upon Dr. Pusey’s work on Daniel, has endeavoured to prove that Daniel’s master was no other than the great king Darius, son of Hystaspes; and that, in fact, Darius of the book of Daniel and Darius of the books of Ezra, Haggai, and Zechariah, were one and the same king.

Your correspondent expresses himself as anything but satisfied of the truth of this identification: and considering that he professes not to have read the work in which the arguments in favour of it are set forth, it may be admitted that his want of conviction is not altogether unnatural. The obvious answer to this writer seems to be, “read the work.” Nevertheless, as he has been at some pains to bring forward certain definite objections to the proposed identification, which appear to him, and possibly therefore to others also, to be “strong, or even apparently insuperable,” and in replying to them, additional light may perhaps be thrown upon the question, we beg leave to offer a few remarks for consideration in answer to his objections.

His first observation is directed merely *ad hominem*, viz., “Since Dr. Pusey, a profound scholar, after twenty-five years of thoughtful study of the book of Daniel,” (he might have added, since Sir Isaac Newton, a profound philosopher, Archbishop Ussher, a profound chronologist, and Joseph Scaliger, the most profound scholar of his age, after an equally lengthened period of study,) have been unable to arrive at this supposed discovery, caution should be exercised in accepting it as a truth. The just inference from which would seem to be, that if the suggested identification should hereafter be accepted as a truth, which undoubtedly it will be, the author of the discovery should be ranked as a more profound scholar than either of the above-named illustrious persons; a conclusion which the author of “*Messiah*,” as also your correspondent, would be among the last to accept.

With this praiseworthy reverence, therefore, for great names, and not so praiseworthy disinclination for the examination of arguments, your correspondent proceeds to expose "the fallacy of this view" concerning "the two Dariuses."

As a set off against his first observation, we may be allowed to quote the words of a generally unfavourable, and therefore impartial critic on "*Messiah*," who writes, "We think that the author has proved his great historical point, that Daniel's master was no other than the great Persian prince Darius, son of Hystaspes, thus far having done a real service towards unfolding the dates of Daniel."^a Let us now examine the supposed difficulties in the way of this conclusion in detail.

I. Your correspondent's first argument is founded upon certain passages in the book of Daniel, such as (Dan. i. 21), "and Daniel continued unto the first year of king Cyrus." And again (vi. 28), "So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius (the Mede) and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian." And again (x. 1), "In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a thing was revealed unto Daniel," in the course of which revelation "the first year of Darius the Mede" is spoken of as already past. From these passages he informs us that it has been inferred, by an able, and certainly a most competent, critic in the *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*,^b to whom he refers, that the reign of Cyrus must necessarily have followed that of Darius the Mede; while, on the other hand, we know from Ezra that the reign of Cyrus, who released the Jews from captivity, preceded that of Darius son of Hystaspes. Nevertheless, this same able critic, in the same *Journal of Prophecy*, has written, "The conclusion appears to us irresistible, that these two monarchs, of the same name, are identical. Those who hold them to be different kings are, of course, obliged to suppose that two several periods, each of seventy years, expired, the one about the beginning of the reign of the first Darius, the other early in the reign of the second Darius." Thus the difficulties on either side the question appear to be "insuperable;" and if the identity of Darius the Mede and Darius the Persian is ever to be admitted, there are but two ways of reconciling the fact with Scripture history; that is, either by assuming that the Cyrus of Daniel, who apparently reigned after Darius, was not the Cyrus of Ezra who released the Jews, and preceded Darius on the throne, or that there is something misunderstood in connection with the passages referred to

^a *The Ecclesiastic*.

October, 1866, p. 362; April, 1867, p. 129.

in Daniel, which seem to separate the Darius of Daniel from the Darius of Ezra.

The writer in the *Journal of Prophecy* is naturally reluctant to allow of any defect in the text of Daniel, and in full consciousness of the pressing difficulty, suggests, "as a possible solution, that there were two Cyruses: the one Cyrus, to whose decree restoring the captivity of the Jews reference was made in the reign of Darius Hystaspes; the other Cyrus, a governor of Babylon, in the end or after the close of the reign of Darius." In support of this suggestion, he refers to native Persian history. And when we examine the authorities, we read indeed of two great kings, the first Kai-Khosru, the hero of the poem *Shah-Nameh*, the second Coresh, who released the Jews. Concerning the first of these kings, Sir William Jones writes, "I shall only doubt that the Khosrau of Firdausi was the Cyrus of the first Greek historian, and the hero of the oldest political and moral romance, when I doubt that Louis Quatorze and Lewis the fourteenth were one and the same French king." And again: "Whatever our chronologers may say, it is not easy to conceive that the Jews were delivered by this Cyrus; the name Coresh has no affinity with the Persian word Khosru, and we cannot suppose any corruption in the sacred text; whereas all the Persian writers agree that a prince named Coresh, who was sent by Bahaman, son of Asfendiar, to govern Babylon, in the room of Baltasar, actually protected the captive Jews, and permitted them to rebuild their temple."^c

The chronicle of Tabari records, that after the death of Kai-Khosru, Lohrasp (Cambyses) took the throne; that Gushtasp (Darius Hystaspes) succeeded him; and that in the reign of Gustasp, a general named Coresh, governor of 'Irâq, was sent against Nabuchodonosor (Nabonadius), who ruled at Babylon, and that having captured this prince he sent him to Balk. After this, Coresh took the throne of Babylon, and immediately released the children of Israel from captivity.^d The whole of this account, though somewhat disguised by the confusion of names, is in perfect harmony with the records of Scriptural history, as set forth in a chart of "Hebrew chronology," lately published by the author of "*Messiah the Prince*," though not in harmony with the common mode of reckoning; and the conquest of Babylon by Coresh, in the reign of Gushtasp, or Darius, not inaptly falls in with the record of a fragment of

^c *Sixth Discourse on the Persians*, p. 106. *Short History of Persia*, p. 411.

^d Zotenberg's *Translation of Tabari*, p. 495.

Abydenus, which informs us that after Cyrus had deposed Nabonadius, and had given him the government of Carmania, Darius drove him away from thence.* Thus Coresh, the general of the Persian historians, would appear to be the Coresh of the book of Ezra who released the Jews, and also the Cyrus of Xenophon who took Babylon, when not yet a king. We fear then that it is impossible to go along with the writer in the *Journal of Prophecy* in his suggestion that the Cyrus of Ezra ruled Babylon after Darius Hystaspes; and we agree with your correspondent, that Dr. Pusey will hardly be disposed to accept of such a solution. The Cyrus referred to in the book of Daniel can only be that Cyrus who is spoken of in the book of Isaiah as saying "to the temple, thy foundation shall be laid;" and that same Cyrus who, according to the book Ezra, declared, "the Lord God of heaven hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem," and this king undoubtedly preceded Darius. It is inconceivable that Daniel should have spoken of a second prince of that name without some mark of distinction. Thus we are driven either to abandon the idea of the identity of the two kings called Darius, or to fall back upon the alternative, that there is something not understood in connection with the passages from the book of Daniel, which appear to sever their identity.

Now it should be particularly observed that the three passages quoted from Daniel all speak of the prophet in the third person, and not in the usual style of the prophetic chapters in which Daniel speaks of himself, which usually run thus: "I, Daniel, fainted"—"I, Daniel, knew by books,"—"I, Daniel, was mourning,"—"I, Daniel, alone saw the vision;"—and especially that Dan. x. 1, which is written in the third person, intervenes between two passages, ix. 2 and x. 2, written in the usual style. The inference from which, not unfrequently arrived at, is, that the three passages in question are additions by some later hand. Indeed, so strongly impressed is your correspondent G. B. with this idea, as regards the two first quotations, that we find him writing, "We think that Dan. i. 21, and vi. 28, contain authentic historical truth, and were not improbably added by Ezra." Here then is an admission very much to the point. It is assumed by him that it was not unlawful for Ezra, when settling the canon, as supposed, to have added words of explanation to the true text of Daniel. It is equally reasonable we submit to surmise, that some subsequent reviser of the canon may have taken upon himself

* Eusebius, *Auch.*, p. 30.

to add the words of Dan. x. 1, as explanatory of the date when the chapter was written. The evidence of addition is almost exactly the same in the three cases, though somewhat stronger, perhaps, in the third.

Your correspondent, however, when he goes on to speak of Dan. x. 1, concerning which verse the author of "*Messiah*" has suggested that it was an addition by way of explanatory heading to the chapter, made probably as late as the time of Simon Justus, or John Hyrcanus, or some other pious interpreter about the time of the Maccabees, changes his expression, and discusses the question as one of suggested "forged interpolation." Now the words "forgery," and "interpolation," are stronger terms than "addition," when applied to a book of Scripture; and the use of them in this case is only one of the ingenious contrivances of controversialists, by way of make-weight, when substantial arguments are not at hand. We are not aware that the author of "*Messiah*" has anywhere suggested the idea of forgery in connection with the book of Daniel. Forgery implies fraud. And as your correspondent could not of course speak of Ezra's supposed additions as fraudulently inserted, so is there no reason for imputing fraud to any subsequent reviser of the book, because he happens to come later than Ezra in point of date. We may dismiss, therefore, the idea of forgery from the question.

Nor do we see any reason to be alarmed with the word "interpolation." Dean Prideaux is high authority upon such subjects, and speaking of Simon Justus, "the last of the men of the great synagogue," he says, "his chiefest work was the finishing of the canon of the Scriptures of the Old Testament," to which were added, after the time of Ezra, the two books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Malachi. "It was by him (Simon, who died in B.C. 292) that the last finishing hand was put thereto, and it was in his time, and under his presidency, and chiefly by his direction, that the canon of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament, by which we now receive them, was perfected." Now, Dean Prideaux, referring to certain passages in the first book of Chronicles and Nehemiah, writes, "I acknowledge these passages to have been *interpolated* passages, both put in after the time of Ezra, and after the time of Nehemiah, by those who completed the canon." With such an authority, therefore, before us, we see no difficulty in the suggestion that Simon Justus, or John Hyrcanus, or some other pious inter-

preter, about the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, may, with the most innocent and, indeed, praiseworthy intention of shewing the application of some of Daniel's prophecies to his own days, have inserted the words of chap. x. 1, with a view to that result.

The holy man who may have inserted that one verse into the book of Daniel, by which a particular date is attached to the vision of the "latter days," in accordance with his own particular conception of the time when the prophecy was delivered, has done no more than holy men in our own days, in full conviction of the correctness of their additions, have done, in affixing dates throughout the Bible to the several chapters in our Authorized Version, the greater portion of which we may safely say are perfectly erroneous. Nor do we think ourselves less justified in calling in question the correctness of the chronology of the supposed interpreter in the days of Antiochus, than in calling in question the whole chronology in the margin of our Bibles. The author of "*Messiah*" has sufficiently shewn from the books of Maccabees, from the Sibylline books, and from Josephus, how strong was the impression prevailing amongst the Jews in the days of the Maccabees, that the "time of trouble," spoken of by Daniel, had then suddenly come upon them, and how what Daniel had foretold concerning the oppressions of a "little horn," or kingdom, arising out of one of the four great empires of the world, was then being inflicted upon them in the person of Antiochus Epiphanes. He also has shewn how it had become necessary, in order to bring such an interpretation of Daniel within the range of possibility, that is to say, to shew how "three score and two weeks," or four hundred and thirty-four years, might be comprehended within the times of Nebuchadnezzar and the time of the setting up of the "abomination of desolation" by Antiochus, that the dates of Daniel's visions should be raised at least some forty-five years. And how again, by the insertion of this one single verse, the desired result has been effectually accomplished, by raising the date of the vision of chap. x., which Daniel had placed in the sixty-second or sixty-third year of the age of Darius, say B.C. 491, to the third year of Cyrus as king of Babylon, which is commonly placed in B.C. 536. Seeing, then, that the verse in question bears all the appearance of an addition by some other hand than that of Daniel; that a pressing necessity appears to have existed for its insertion about the time suggested; and that by its insertion the unquestionable identity of Darius the Mede and the Darius of Ezra has been cut asunder; we have no hesitation, in answer to your correspondent's first objection, in affirming, that it is the interpolation of

this one single verse in the book of Daniel which has been the occasion of all the difficulties in the chronological arrangement of that book, as also of innumerable other chronological difficulties which result from it throughout the Bible. Take away the erroneous date attached to chap. x., and the supposed insuperable difficulty in the way of the identification of Ezra's Darius with the Darius of Daniel disappears.

II. A second objection raised by your correspondent is derived from another writer in the *Journal of Prophecy*, who, we fear, must be characterized as not so able as the last. This writer observes: "It is a noble task to seek to establish the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks. But when we approach it, let us (so to speak) 'put off our shoes,' as those who are conscious that they are standing on holy ground. Let us not shrink from avowing—that holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Now, God forbid that any one should seek to approach this great and holy subject except in a spirit of the deepest reverence and fear. We tread, indeed, on holy ground. And yet it behoves the enquirer well to mark the limits of the consecrated ground on which he treads. Let us first define how far the words contained in the book of Daniel are words dictated by the Holy Ghost to Daniel, and how far they are words dictated merely by the zeal of pious men, and added to the book; and then let us approach with humble reverence the interpretation of the prophecy. The suggestion of the author of "*Messiah*" is, that one single verse of the present text of Daniel, bearing all the marks of subsequent addition, alone stands in the way of the identification of the two kings Darius; and that when they are identified, the prophecy needs no further explanation, for it reads as simple history of the past. This writer in the *Journal of Prophecy* does not question the possibility of the assumed addition, but points out what he conceives to be objections to the historical arrangement which result from the removal of the passage. For the date, he observes, of the first year of Darius, when set over the realm of the Chaldeans, thus becomes fixed to the year B.C. 492-1, a year or two before the date of the battle of Marathon, and his second year falls in the year B.C. 491-90, close upon the time of that famous battle. In the first year, that is, probably in B.C. 491, Daniel is delivered from the den of lions. In the second year the building of the temple is suddenly resumed by the Jews, and opposed by the Samaritans, headed by Tatnai and Shethar-boznai. So that, "at the very time when Tatnai and Shethar-boznai were endeavouring to compel Zerubbabel and the Jews to desist from the work of the temple, which had been resumed

at the divine command, Daniel, the illustrious Hebrew prophet and statesman, was prime minister at the court of Darius." "On this strange hypothesis," he adds, "we seem to be called on to believe that Daniel, during probably a year and a half, *had never once named the decree of Cyrus concerning the Jewish temple to Ezra's Darius*, and, indeed, that the illustrious prophet never openly exerted himself to render any important assistance to the returned Jews while he was prime minister to Ezra's Darius."

Now we confess that we do not perceive the process of reasoning by which this writer has arrived at the conclusion that Daniel, now high in power, had remained in this state of apathy concerning his brethren at Jerusalem, and the holy temple of Jerusalem. We arrive, indeed, at an entirely opposite conclusion. In the first place we read in the book of Daniel, chap. ix., one of the most fervent, touching, and beautiful prayers from the mouth of Daniel ever offered up to the Almighty, beseeching Him to turn away his anger from the city of Jerusalem, and to cause his "face to shine upon the sanctuary which is desolate." In the next chapter the prophet tells us that he was "mourning three full weeks," during which time he was opposed by "the prince of Persia," and that the contest ended by his remaining "there with the kings of Persia." These two expressions are usually, and most properly explained, as referring to the desire of Daniel to return to the city of Jerusalem, to rebuild the temple of his God, and to the thwarting of this desire by the court of Persia, so that he was prevented from going up. Now all this took place, according to the proposed arrangement, in the first year of Darius, B.C. 491. Again it was in this or the following year, that we read of a decree having been issued by Darius, "That in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel." Are we to suppose that Daniel took no part in advising and preparing this decree? Is it not obvious from the words which follow,—"*He is the living God, and steadfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion unto the end,*"—that Daniel himself was the writer of that decree, which in fact is equivalent to a permission to erect a temple to the living God? How ardently must Daniel have worked upon the mind of his royal master, to have brought about so signal a change in the policy of the court of Persia, which had so recently forbidden the erection of the temple at Jerusalem, lest it should lead to independence, and "damage to the revenue of the kings" (Ezra iv. 13). So much then for the charge of want of sympathy on the part of Daniel towards his

countrymen, and want of zeal in urging their cause before the king. And now again, while Daniel is thus praying at Babylon, and striving against the nobles of Persia, and contending with their prince concerning the interests of his nation, we find at Jerusalem, in the second year of Darius, B.C. 490, that notwithstanding the strict prohibition of Artach-Shastha the king, Zerubbabel the governor, and Haggai and Zechariah the prophets, are engaged in urging on the work of the temple. This open disobedience of the king's command on the part of his governor at Jerusalem is so remarkable, as hardly to be accounted for by the mere preaching and encouragement of the prophets; but, on the other hand, it becomes strikingly apt and comprehensible, on the supposition that the elevation of Daniel had now become known to Zerubbabel, as also the fact, that the heart of the king was with him in this matter, though as yet the decree of Cyrus had not been discovered. We cannot divine from what sources this writer has derived his evidence when he asserts that Darius "appears never to have heard the name of Daniel or of Daniel's God until the letter of Tatnai called his attention to it: nor can we perceive the force of the observation that, when the Jews on being urged by the prophet Haggai to rebuild the temple, made reply, 'The time is not come, the time that the Lord's house should be built;' "this plea would have been simply absurd if Daniel had been at that time the all-powerful and confidential minister of Darius." If the Jews felt no scruple in replying to the messenger of the Almighty, who called upon them to build, that "the time was not come," why should they be more scrupulous in making the same reply, because they had heard of the rumoured elevation of Daniel at the court of Persia?

Again we have seen reason to believe that Daniel may not yet, perhaps, have become the all-powerful minister which this writer supposes, considering the opposition he appears to have met with both from the prince and nobles around him. And this known hostility to Daniel and his people amongst the courtiers may perhaps account, if it is necessary to account for it, for the appeal of the Samaritans to Darius, notwithstanding his known favour towards Daniel.

Thus, according to the proposed identification of the two kings Darius, Daniel prays for the restoration of the temple in the first year of Darius, B.C. 491: the rebuilding in natural sequence goes on in the second year of Darius, B.C. 490, and the building is completed in the sixth year of the same reign, B.C. 486-5. According to the view preferred by this writer, Daniel prays for the

restoration of the temple in the year B.C. 538, in the first year of a great king called Darius, no trace of whom can be found in secular history. The rebuilding goes on eighteen years later in B.C. 520, in the second year of another well-known king called Darius. The first of these kings having begun to reign just seventy years after the desolation of Jerusalem, the other at the end of seventy years' indignation against Jerusalem; and yet they are not to be considered as reigning at the same time. We leave the reader to judge between the two arrangements.

III. The next observation of your correspondent deserves consideration. Since "Darius and his courtiers in his second year were forming plans and making preparations for a formidable invasion of Greece, which was to terminate in the disastrous defeat at Marathon," B.C. 490, how could "they whom the Lord had sent to walk to and fro through the earth have said to the angel of the Lord, 'we have walked to and fro through the earth, and behold all the earth sitteth still and is at rest?'" (Zech. i. 11). The answer to this observation is, that the word translated "earth" should be translated "land," that is, *the land* of promise. The words of Zechariah have reference to the words of Isaiah, xiv. 7, and also to the words of Haggai, ii. 6—9, when alluding to these very preparations against Greece, ending at length in the overthrow of the hosts of Xerxes, "and in this place," that is in the land of Judæa, "I will give peace, saith the Lord of hosts." For it was while these wars were raging in the heathen world, that the government of Zerubbabel at Jerusalem was set up; and at that time it might be truly said of Judæa, "all the land sitteth still and is at rest."

IV. Your correspondent next observes, that Darius took the city of Babylon, after a siege of twenty months, about the year B.C. 516. "It seems, therefore, inexplicable that Darius should be described as so taking the kingdom of Chaldea in B.C. 492." In reply to this observation, we think that whether the accession of Darius to the throne of Persia be placed, with Herodotus, in B.C. 521, or with Ctesias and the Parian Chronicle, in B.C. 517, your correspondent will find difficulty in proving that the final overthrow of Babylon took place so early as the year that he has named. Darius himself has left a record of two captures of Babylon in the course of the first four or five years of his reign; the first with an army under his own command, the second by an army under the command of Intaphres.*

* See Inscription at Behistûn.

Neither of these sieges bears any resemblance to that carried on by the assistance of Zopyrus, which lasted for twenty months, and which Darius himself conducted in person. The third and final overthrow of Babylon, when the walls were thrown down and the gates carried off by Darius, must therefore have been at a much later date than B.C. 516.

V. Again, how, he asks, could the year B.C. 492-1 be called by Ezra, or any other writer, the first year of Darius, when set over the realm of the Chaldeans, if Babylon was destroyed by Darius at so early a date as B.C. 516?

We have already shewn that Babylon was not finally subdued in the early part of the reign of Darius, and that Herodotus is in error upon this point. But Herodotus informs us that the city revolted on the sailing of the Persian fleet to Samos. Now the Persian fleet sailed twice to Samos; first to re-establish Syloson in the government of that island, soon after the death of Cambyses, B.C. 518, five years after which time we have seen that Babylon had not been destroyed; a second time to establish Æaces, the son of Syloson, in that island as king. Now if the capture of Babylon took place a few years after this second expedition, it would have been taken about the time which we have fixed, B.C. 492. It is quite clear also, that when Daniel speaks of the "first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, when set over the realm of the Chaldeans," he is speaking of a later period in his reign than that when he was set over the realm of the Medes. When, also, this first year is placed by Daniel about the sixty-second year of his age, it is equally clear that the time referred to must have been towards the latter end of his reign, not towards the beginning.

Claysmore, 28th October, 1867.

J. W. BOSANQUET.

PROPHECY OF THE WEEKS IN DANIEL IX. 24—27.

My best thanks are due to the Rev. Josiah Pratt for his reply to my remarks on his views on chronology contained in your last number, p. 210. My thanks are due because I cannot doubt that the verdict of your readers must be for me on every point at issue between us, unless something more convincing can be produced than Mr. Pratt has produced against my scheme of chronology.

I. And first, as to the Parian chronicle. Happily, Mr. Pratt does not doubt, nor represent Corsini as doubting, that the author of the

Parian chronicle (who must have lived not long after the time of Alexander), must be better authority than Diodorus Siculus, (who lived in the time of Augustus), as to the period between the Peloponnesian war and the death of Alexander.

The only question between us on this head is as to whether the great discrepancy between the Parian chronicle and Diodorus can be reasonably attributed *to the blundering of the mason who engraved the Marble*. But I must set forth the corrections of the Marble which are needed, and have been suggested in order to bring the Marble into agreement with Diodorus.

I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.
Olympic dates of Diodorus.	Julian Years B.C.	Archons of Athens in the order of Diodorus.	Dates of Archons according to the Marble.	Suggested Corrections.	Archons named on the Marble.
92 Ol. 4	409	1. Diocles	148		<i>Diocles</i>
93 1	408	2. Euctemon	147 (ΠΙΙ)	144	Euctemon
2	407	3. Antigenes	146		
3	406	4. Callias	145 (Π)	143	Antigenes
4	405	5. Alexias	144		
94 1	404	Anarchy	143	142	Callias
2	403	Euclides	142		<i>Alexias</i>
3	402	Micion	141		
4	401	Exænetus	140		
95 1	400	Laches	139 (ΠΙΙΙ)		Micion
2	399	Aristocrates	138		
			137 (ΠΙΙ)	136	Laches
			136		
			135 (Π)		Aristocrates

In this diagram, col. i. gives the Olympic dates which Diodorus has given to his archons; col. ii. gives the corresponding Julian dates B.C.; col. iii. gives the archons of Athens in the order of Diodorus; col. iv. gives the dates of the archons in the era of the Marble, as copied by Selden the year after it was brought to England, and they are the same in both of his editions of 1628 and 1629; col. v. gives the needed corrections, as suggested in Chandler's *Marmora Oxoniensia*, of 1763; col. vi. gives the archons named on the Marble, save that Diocles and Alexias are not on the Marble.

Thus, according to the Marble, Aristocrates must have been three years farther from Euctemon than he was according to Diodorus. The final seven for Euctemon is given on the Marble as ΠΙΙ, and to make this harmonize with Diodorus it is suggested that the mason who engraved the Marble must have engraved ΠΙΙ (7), instead of ΠΙΙ (4). Nor can I urge that the insertion of the additional hori-

zontal line would of itself be such a blundering as to be *à priori* improbable. But this alteration of the date for Euctemon requires that the Marble date for Antigenes should also be altered from 145 to 143, that is, the mason must have engraved Π (5) instead of ΙΙΙ (3). This, of course, must of itself be improbable; for it involves not only the insertion of an additional horizontal line, but also the omission of an iota; but it also involves the alteration of the Marble date for Callias from 143 to 142, that is, the mason must have engraved ΙΙΙ (3) instead of ΙΙ (2). This, too, is of itself improbable; but it also involves the alteration of the Marble date for Micon from 139 to 138, that is, the mason must have engraved ΠΙΙΙΙ (9) instead of ΠΙΙΙ (8). This, too, is of itself improbable; but it also involves the alteration of the Marble date for Laches from 137 to 136, that is, the mason must have engraved ΠΙΙ (7) instead of ΠΙ (6). This, too, is of itself improbable, and that the mason should have made all these blunders is quite incredible.

It is also quite incredible that if such and so many blunders had been made by the mason, they should not have been perceived and corrected by the author of the Marble. The date of Callias had been obliterated from the Marble before it came to England, but Selden could not doubt, as he says, that it must have been 143 from the age of Sophocles being given by the Marble, as 91 in the year of Callias's archonship. The Marble had previously given the age of Sophocles as 28 in the archonship of Apsephion in the 206th year of its era, and consequently it must have been in the 143rd year of its era that he was 91.

From this it follows that Callias was the fifth from Euctemon, and if, as Diodorus says, Diocles was the next before Euctemon, and Alexias the next after Callias, Alexias must have been the seventh from Diocles, and, as I noticed in your number for July last, p. 477, according to Lysias, who lived in the time of the Peloponnesian war, Alexias was the seventh from Diocles. Thus, not only must the Marble be regarded as truly representing the mind of its author, in regard to these archons, but the author is confirmed by the most unexceptionable testimony, and if Diodorus has given the right Olympic date of 93 Ol. 3, that is, B.C. 406, to Callias, and rightly placed the archonship of Euctemon in the 24th year of the Peloponnesian war, there can be but little, if any, doubt that Alexias must have been the seventh, and not the fifth, from Diocles, as given by Diodorus, and so the war must have begun at least two years before B.C. 431, the date assigned to it by Diodorus.

I have also shewn in my *Light upon Thucydides*, p. 20—2, that the Marble is confirmed by Demosthenes and Polybius as to the variation of the three years between the archonships of Euctemon and Aristocrates. But these are not the only instances in which the Marble must be altered in order to bring it into harmony with Diodorus. The Marble places the accession of some king of Macedon in the 93rd year of its era. What remained of this inscription was *Κεδονων Βασιλευει*, and Selden has interpreted this as referring to the accession of Philip of Macedon; but this would place his accession not merely two or three, but six years farther from the Peloponnesian war than it is placed by Diodorus; and Prideaux, in his edition of the Marble in 1676, p. 160, gives the inscription exactly as it is given by Selden; but in his p. 173 (where he has given the inscription in a common character, and with a Latin version) he gives *Φιλίππου τὴν πόλιν ἔκτισεν ὁ Φίλιππος Μακεδόνων βασιλεὺς*.

In the same year Selden's copies of the Marble give the death of Artaxerxes. This would place the death of Artaxerxes Memor eight years farther from the Peloponnesian war than it is placed by Diodorus; and Prideaux, in giving the inscription in a common character, instead of giving Artaxerxes as it is given by the Marble, gives Alexander Pheræus. But, surely, it is not very probable that the mason could have mistaken *Μακεδονων βασιλευς* for *Μακεδονων βασιλευει*, and that he should have mistaken Alexander Pheræus for Artaxerxes is utterly incredible.

I should also notice that the interval which the Marble places between the Peloponnesian war and the accession of Philip of Macedon, is quite confirmed by Aulus Gellius.

Thus, I doubt not, that the verdict of your readers will be that the great discrepancy between the Parian chronicle and Diodorus cannot be reasonably attributed to the blundering of the mason who engraved the Marble; and further, that the Marble must be regarded as truly representing the mind of its author, and that on his authority the chronology of Diodorus for this period ought to be rejected, and that the Olympic date, which Diodorus has assigned to the archonship of Aristocrates, ought not to be adopted as the basis for determining the date of the erection of the Marble.

II. Further, Mr. Pratt admits that the additional archons mentioned by Demosthenes in his *De Coronâ*, and not found in Diodorus's list, also present a difficulty to the followers of Diodorus; but he offers no solution of the difficulty.

The solution offered by Corsini and others is, that these archons

were pseudeponymous, that is, not the true archons, who gave their names to their years. But this is a childish suggestion, seeing that the names of these archons are given as the dates of the decrees in which they are found. This is very remarkable in the case of Mnesithides. Demosthenes asks in court for two decrees and their dates. The decrees are read, but not their dates. Upon this, Demosthenes asks for their dates, and the only answer was, Mnesithides was archon. Subsequent critics have held that this solution was untenable, and in their turn have suggested that the decrees, in which these archons are named, are spurious. Let my opponents produce a single MS. or printed copy of Demosthenes, in which these decrees are wanting. That the decrees were important as evidence on behalf of Demosthenes must be admitted by all who will read his *Oration on the Crown*, and if Demosthenes were anxious that the whole of his defence should be handed down to posterity, the decrees must have been included. It is true, Demosthenes has referred to other decrees which have not been handed down to us, but our wonder should be, not that this oration has not come down to us in a more perfect state, but that it has come down to us as perfect as it is, and the absence of these decrees would fall as heavily upon those who suggest that the decrees which we have are spurious; for whoever would be tempted to fabricate some, would be tempted to fabricate the whole of them.

Further, it is reasonable to assume that the archons must have been believed to be genuine, even if the decrees were spurious; for the fabricator would scarcely have given such an obvious clue to the detection of his fraud, as would be afforded by his inserting the names of men as archons who never had been archons.

Further, there must be an end to all argument, if testimony which tells against us may be thus disposed of, and these additional archons of Demosthenes and the Parian chronicle mutually support each other. Thus, I claim the verdict of your readers on this head.

III. We now come to St. Luke, to whom Mr. Pratt refers as authority for A. D. 29 being the year of the crucifixion. We learn from St. Luke iii. 1, 3, that in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, John the Baptist began to preach the baptism of repentance, and from St. John ii. 13, v. 1, vi. 4, xix. 14, we learn that Jesus was present at three, if not four, passovers after his baptism by John. From this it follows that His crucifixion must have been not less than three years after the 15th of Tiberius. This is admitted by Mr. Pratt, as he says in your number for January, 1867, p. 467, "His

public ministry lasted somewhat more than three years, viz., from his baptism to his death." But Mr. Pratt raises a question as to what St. Luke meant by the 15th of Tiberius.

In your p. 469 Mr. Pratt says, "St. Luke says that the baptist began in the 15th year of the ἡγεμονία of Tiberius Cæsar. The 15th year of Tiberius's *reign* would be A.D. 28-29, which does not suit my purpose. St. Luke, however, does not say the μοναρχία or βασιλεία of Tiberius, but his ἡγεμονία, a more general term; as appears from his saying in the very next clause that Pilate ἡγεμόνευε τῆς Ἰουδαίας." To this I replied in your number for July last, p. 480, noticing that the word ἡγεμονία occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, but that it was repeatedly used by Philo and Josephus in reference to the reigns of the Cæsars, including the reign of Tiberius, and that they each assigned to the ἡγεμονία of Tiberius the same number of years that was given to his reign by Tacitus. To the instances of this, their use of the word which I then produced, I could have added many others. From this it is obvious that with Philo and Josephus ἡγεμονία was quite synonymous with μοναρχία and βασιλεία, and that when they spoke of the ἡγεμονία of Tiberius, they did not include the years during which he was emperor in the provinces in common with Augustus. On the contrary, Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 2, 2, expressly says, "Augustus died at the age of seventy-seven years, and Tiberius succeeded Cæsar in the hegemony (διαδέχεται τὴν ἡγεμονίαν)." To devise language more explicit than this seems impossible, and in the face of it to suggest that St. Luke, when speaking of the ἡγεμονία of Tiberius, meant that it began three years before the death of Augustus, is almost unpardonable. In your number for October last, p. 212, Mr. Pratt also says, "It is notorious that the reigns of kings and emperors are often computed from more epochs than one." "In like manner, Tiberius Cæsar became first known to the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine by the law which made him emperor of all the provinces three years before the death of Augustus. That death made no difference in the *hegemony* conferred on Tiberius by that law, except that he held it alone: he only continued to hold the *hegemony* which he had already in the provinces for three years, etc. It is perfectly natural, therefore, to conclude that Luke means Tiberius's provincial ἡγεμονία, and dates its 15th year from his first accession to it in A.D. 11." To this I reply that Josephus was an inhabitant of Palestine, and must have been twenty-six years old in A.D. 63, the date which Bishop Tomline assigned to the publication of St. Luke's gospel, and must have been well acquainted with all

that concerned Tiberius in the province, and yet does not speak of the years of his provincial ἡγεμονία when he speaks of the years of his ἡγεμονία; and it is perfectly natural, therefore, to conclude that St. Luke did not mean his provincial ἡγεμονία, when he spoke of the 15th year of his ἡγεμονία as the date of John the baptist's ministry.

As St. Luke, Philo, and Josephus, all spoke the same Greek language, and at about the same time, it is but reasonable to suppose that they all used the word ἡγεμονία in the same sense.

Thus, I claim the verdict of your readers on this point, viz., that St. Luke's using ἡγεμονία, and not μοναρχία, or βασιλεία, in reference to the rule of Tiberius, affords no ground for supposing that he dated its 15th year from his first accession to it, three years before the death of Augustus, in A.D. 11.

IV. I will now turn to Tertullian. In your Journal for January, 1863, p. 416, Mr. Pratt, speaking of the crucifixion, says, "The year which seems to possess the best claims to be considered the true year is A.D. 29, as may be proved by many arguments; *inter alia*, Tertullian, a most acute man, who searched and studied the veritable *Acta*, or dispatches of Pilate to Tiberius, in the archives at Rome, and appealed to them in his writings in defence of Christianity, at the end of the second century, asserts that, 'Christ was revealed' (*i.e.*, commenced his public ministry), '*a duodecimo anno Tiberii*,' that is, A.D. $\frac{25}{8}$, and suffered '*coss. duobus Geminis, mense Martii*,' *i.e.*, March, A.D. 29." But there must be some mistake here, for within two pages of this passage (*Adv. Marcion.*, l. 1, c. 15, p. 372), quoted by Mr. Pratt as to the 12th of Tiberius, Tertullian says, "*Anno. xv. Tiberii, Christus Jesus de cælo manare dignatus est, spiritus salutaris*" (c. xix., p. 374). This evidently refers to the baptism of Christ, and in the passage (*Adv. Judæos*, c. viii., p. 191), in which Tertullian places his crucifixion in the 15th of Tiberius, he states that he was about 30 years of age at the time. From this it is probable that Tertullian adopted the opinion held by Clemens Al., *Strom.*, i. 407, and others, and refuted by Irenæus, l. 2, c. xxii., p. 146, that the ministry of our Lord lasted but one year, and so placed his baptism and crucifixion in the same year. Clemens says, that Christ must have suffered in the 15th year of Tiberius, because he had learned from St. Luke that John began his ministry in the 15th of Tiberius, and that Christ preached but one year, *the acceptable year of the Lord* (Luke iv. 19).

Thus, by considering the circumstances under which Tertullian

may have placed the crucifixion in the consulship of the two Gemini as the 15th of Tiberius, his placing it in this year may be regarded as an expression of his opinion as to what St. Luke must have meant by the 15th of Tiberius, in which he (St. Luke) placed the baptism of Christ.

Further, Tertullian not only says that the crucifixion was in the month of March, as noticed by Mr. Pratt, but goes on immediately and says, that it was on "the 25th of March, the first day of unleavened bread, on which they were commanded by Moses to kill the lamb in the evening."

That the crucifixion could not have been on the 25th of March, A.D. 29, Mr. Pratt must admit, because he states that, according to Professor Airey, the full moon in March, A.D. 29, was on the 18th of the month. Mr. Pratt would scarcely contend that Tertullian found the 25th March in the veritable *Acta Pilati*.

Thus, this most acute man, Tertullian, has fallen into some mistakes, and I presume the verdict of your readers will be that we should hold him to be right where he agrees with St. Luke in placing the 30th year of our Lord, and (in another passage) his coming down from heaven, in the 15th of Tiberius. Nor does Tertullian leave us in doubt as to what he meant by the 15th of Tiberius—that he meant the 15th year after the death of Augustus. Tertullian also gives the reign of Tiberius as 22 years, 7 months, 20 days, in accordance with Philo, Josephus, and Tacitus.

V. I will now turn to the limits within which the passover must have taken place in any year, which shews that the 18th of March is too early for a Paschal full moon. Philo, *De Septem*, p. 293, speaking of the Passover, says, "This month is the seventh, both in number and order, according to the cycle of the sun, but, in effect, it is the first, because it is described as the first in the sacred books. And (as I think) this is the reason. It happens that the vernal equinox is both the copy and imitation of that beginning in which this world was made." In his *De Decem Orac.*, p. 206, Philo says, "He has allotted to the number seven the greatest feasts and those with the most days at the yearly equinoxes, in the spring and in the autumn, having assigned two to the two, each for seven days." In his *De Mose*, l. 3, tom. ii., p. 169, Philo says, "Moses describes the beginning of the vernal equinox as the first month in the periods of years." Josephus, *Ant.*, iii. 10, 5, says, "In the month of Xanthicus, which we call Nisan, and is the beginning of the year, on the 14th day, according to the moon, when the sun is in Aries, he commanded us to

sacrifice the passover every year." The obvious conclusion from this is that the crucifixion, which took place on the 14th day on which the Jews killed the passover, must have been whilst the sun was in Aries.

S. Ambrose, *Epist. Episcop. Æmil.*, 16, tom. iii., 940, says, "Nor do I think it absurd that we should follow the example of keeping the month in which the passover was first celebrated. Wherefore our ancestors, in the decree of the Council of Nice, rightly kept the month of new fruits. But the month begins, not according to common use, but according to the learned, from the equinox, which is the twelfth calends of April (21st March) and ends the eleventh calends of May (21st April)." Bede, in his *De Tem. Rat.*, cap. xxviii., tom. ii., 101, says, "The rule for the Church's observance, confirmed by the Council of Nice, holds that the day of the passover should be sought from the 22nd March to 25th April. Also a rule of Catholic institution commands that the passover be not celebrated before the vernal equinox. Therefore, whoever thinks that the equinox was on the eighth calends of April (March 25), must either say that it is lawful for the passover to be kept before the equinox, or deny the lawfulness of the passover being kept before the eighth calends of April (March 25). He must also affirm that the passover, which the Lord kept with his disciples the day before he suffered, was not on the ninth calends of April (24th March), or that it was before the equinox. Nor is this only a matter of our times, but also the legal and Mosaic institution decrees that the day of the Paschal feast should not be celebrated before the day of the equinox, as Anatholius testifies that Philo and Josephus plainly teach: so also, their predecessors, Agatobulus and his pupil, Aristobulus of Paneas, who was one of the LXX. elders sent by the priests to king Ptolemy to translate the Hebrew books into the Greek tongue. They gave answers to the king on his proposing and enquiring many things of the traditions of Moses. Therefore, when they explained the questions on Exodus, they said that the passover must not be sacrificed before the vernal equinox."

The substance of this is also given by Eusebius, in an extract from the Paschal Canons of Anatolius, *Hist.*, vii. 32. Scaliger, *De Em. Temp.*, p. 531, gives Hilarion as saying that, according to astronomers, the crucifixion was on the day of the preparation, on the 15th day of the moon, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐαρινῆς ἰσημερίας.

Among the spurious works printed with Chrysostom, tom. viii., p. 277, I find as follows, "We have wise Hebrew witnesses, such as Philo and Josephus, and some others, who, by their own documents,

strongly maintain that the passover cannot be accurately kept other than after the vernal equinox, and they decide that this limit was observed with the 14th day, according to the moon, from the first, as has been often said. And these men clearly (as all Jews know), were after the suffering of the Saviour, and lived a considerable time afterwards. So that it is clear that the Saviour suffered at the passover of the Jews after the equinox." Epiphanius, *De Hæres.*, i., 421, says, "The Catholic Church observes not only the 14th day of the moon, but also the course of the sun, lest by keeping two passovers in one year, there should be none kept in the next. Wherefore we keep the 14th day, but we pass the equinox." Sir I. Newton, *Daniel*, p. 160, "The 14th of Nisan always fell on the full moon next after the vernal equinox."

Selden, *De Anno Civil.*, c. v., p. 18, says, "They have decided, from a most received tradition from their ancestors, that this festive time should not begin until it is quite evident that the vernal equinox, which they call Tekuphan Nisan, would happen either before or on the day following the sacrifice." This would allow the day of sacrifice, that is, the 14th of Nisan, to be on the day before the equinox, but not earlier. In his c. xx., p. 63, Selden says, "Indeed, I am persuaded that the decision of Christians not to keep the passover until after the vernal equinox came to them from the teaching of the Jews, which I have already set forth, and which is received from the Talmudists."

Maimonides, *De Ratione Intercalandi*, c. iv., s. 1, says, "The year, which they made one month longer, was called an intercalary year; but no other month was ever added to the year than the month Adar. Therefore, in the intercalary year there were two consecutive months of Adar, called Adar 1 and Adar 2. But why was this? Namely, that the passover might be held with the harvest; for it is said in the law, Thou shalt observe the month of first fruits. The meaning of this is, that you should keep that account of time which would bring this month to the harvest, and if you did not add a second month of Adar, the passover would be sometimes in the winter, and sometimes in the summer season. The intercalary year was instituted for three reasons, 1. On account of the equinox; 2. On account of the fruits of the earth; 3. On account of the berries of the trees. So, if the Sanhedrim understood from the account in the tables that the equinox would be either on the 16th of Nisan or later, it should add a second month of Adar to the year, that when the passover came the fruit might be ripe."

By this rule of Maimonides, the feast of unleavened bread might be on, but could not be before, the equinox, and the 14th of Nisan might be on, but could not be earlier, than the day before the equinox, as also held by Selden, and when the course of the moon would cause these days of Nisan to be earlier in regard to the equinox than their stated times, the second month of Adar (Veadar) was intercalated, and the Paschal month of Nisan was put off to the following moon.

We presume that Mr. Pratt must be convinced by this cloud of witnesses, and especially by this testimony of Maimonides, that the crucifixion, which he admits to have been on the 14th of Nisan, could not have been earlier than the day before the equinox, and the only question must be, on what day did the vernal equinox fall in the time of our Saviour?

According to Columella, as I noticed in my letter in July last, the sun entered Aries on the 17th March. Pliny, *N. H.*, 18, c. xxvi., p. 489, says, "The vernal equinox seems to take place on the 8th calends of April (March 25)," but, Ferguson, in his *Astronomy*, p. 390, says, "The sun always enters Aries at the instant of the vernal equinox, which, in our Saviour's time, fell on the 22nd of March."

I presume Mr. Pratt will scarcely deny that Columella and Pliny must both be wrong and Ferguson right, as to the day of the vernal equinox being on the 22nd March in the time of our Saviour; and as in A.D. 29 the full moon in March was on the 18th day of the month, the equinox on the 22nd would have fallen some days after the 16th of Nisan, without an intercalation. Thus, according to Maimonides, A.D. 29 was clearly a year in which the second month of Adar was to be intercalated, and thus the month of Nisan would be put off to the next moon, which became full on the 17th April, and so the full moon on the 18th March, A.D. 29, must be hopelessly excluded from being the Paschal full moon at the time of the crucifixion.

In your Journal of January, 1863, p. 417, Mr. Pratt says, "Professor Airey suspects that March 18 would be too early in the year for the passover."

We now come to the rule for determining the 14th of Nisan. Sir Isaac Newton, on *Daniel*, p. 160, says, "I take it for granted that the passover was on Friday, the 14th of the month Nisan, the great feast of the passover on Saturday, the 15th of Nisan, and the resurrection on the day following. Now the 14th day of Nisan

always fell on the full moon next after the vernal equinox, and the month began at the new moon before, not at the true conjunction, but at the first appearance of the new moon; for the Jews referred all the time of the silent moon, as they phrased it, that is, of the moon's disappearing, to the old moon; and because the first appearance might usually be about eighteen hours after the true conjunction, they therefore began their month from the sixth hour at evening, that is, at sunset, next after the eighteenth hour from the conjunction. And this rule they called π jach, designating by the letters \cdot and π the number 18."

Ferguson, in his *Astronomy*, p. 389, for the same reason, says, "The passover was always kept on the day of the full moon, and the full moon at which it was kept was that which happened next after the equinox." Such are the opinions of Sir Isaac Newton and Ferguson. But what evidence is there, either directly that the crucifixion was at a full moon, or that the Jews reckoned their new moon from its first appearance, that is, from its phasis?

In your Journal of July last, p. 481, I referred to Philo, *De Mose*, iii., tom. ii., p. 169, as evidence that the 14th of Nisan must have been on the full of the moon.

In your Journal of October last, p. 211, Mr. Pratt produces this passage from Philo as follows, $\tau\omega\mu\eta\nu\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omega$ (Nisan), $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\epsilon\lambda\eta\nu\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\nu\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \pi\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\phi\alpha\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, i. e., 'when the moon's orb was *about* to become full of light.' The Latin translator, missing the point of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$, renders this 'toto lunæ orbe collustrato lumine;' which has misled Mr. Parker into saying that the crucifixion must have been *on* a full moon, instead of *just before* a full moon; according to Philo and Josephus, Nisan 15 was always *on* the full moon between March 17 and April 17. Hence Mr. Parker's year, A.D. 33, is out of the question; because in that year the Paschal full moon, or Nisan 15, was on a Friday (as he proves from Ferguson's *Astronomy*); therefore Nisan 14, when the Paschal lambs would be killed, was a *Thursday*, but our Lord was crucified on a *Friday*.

I trust I have shewn satisfactorily that Nisan 15 could not have been before March 22, the vernal equinox; but this passage of Philo has also been noticed by Selden, in his *De Anno Civ.*, c. xx., and he translates it, "Eodem in mense, die decimaquartâ, sub tempus ipsum, quo suum orbem lumine complere solet luna, celebratur pascha."

Selden also quotes the statement of Josephus, as to the sacri-

ficing of the passover on the 14th of Xanthicus, when the sun was in Aries, and adds, “Ubi Rufinus, *quartadecima luna, sole opposito in ariete*. Quod plane intelligendum de lunâ decimaquartâ non ab ipso synodo putatâ, sed à lunâ primâ, seu neomeniâ lunari civiliter sumptâ juxta superius explicata, si aut Talmudicis aut Scriptuariis credendum.”

Spencer, *De Leg., Heb.*, iii., c. iii., 827, says, “It is certain that the Hebrews kept their more celebrated feasts in the middle of the month, that is, at the full moon,” and he also quotes this passage of Philo as evidence that the passover on the 14th of the first month was kept when the moon was wont to shine with its full light. In his extract from the Paschal canons of Anatolius, Eusebius also says that Aristobulus adds that “on the day assigned to the passover, the 14th day of the month, at evening, the moon will be in diametrical opposition to the sun, as we may see at the full moons.”

Epiphanius, *Cont. Hæres.*, i., 421, says, “It was needful that Christ should be sacrificed on the 14th day, according to the law, that the light which enlightened them might cease on the sun arising and covering the shining of the moon; for from the 14th day and downwards, the light of the moon decreases.”

Bede, *De Temp. Rat.*, c. xxv., tom. ii., 94, says, “S. Jerome, in interpreting the sentence of the gospel, in which it is said, that at the passion of the Lord there was darkness on the earth, says, ‘They who have written against the gospels suspect that the disciples of Christ, from their ignorance at the resurrection, described the eclipse of the sun, which is wont to happen in the spring and summer time, though an eclipse of the sun never happens except at new moon.’ But no one doubts that the moon was at its fullest at the time of the passover.” Nor, in this controversy, should we pass over our present rule for finding Easter.

See Wheatley on the Book of Common Prayer to this effect:—In the first ages of Christianity there arose a great difference between the churches of Asia, and other churches, about the day whereon Easter ought to be observed. “The churches of Asia kept their Easter upon the same day on which the Jews celebrated their passover, viz., upon the 14th day of their first month, Nisan (which month began at the new moon, next to the next vernal equinox, and this they did upon what day of the week soever it fell), and were from thence called quartodecimans, or such as kept Easter upon the 14th day after the *φάσις*, or appearance of the moon; whereas the other churches, especially those of the west, did not follow their

custom, but kept their Easter on the Sunday following the Jewish passover." "That this dispute might never arise again, these paschal canons were passed at the Council of Nice. 1. That the 21st day of March shall be accounted the vernal equinox; 2. that the full moon happening upon or next after the 21st day of March, shall be taken for the full moon of Nisan." Upon this I should notice, first, that the quartodeciman dispute was not as to the Jewish day on which the crucifixion took place, whether it was the 14th or 15th of Nisan. Both parties evidently assumed that it was on the 14th. Nor was this dispute as to whether the 14th of Nisan at the crucifixion was before or after the vernal equinox. Both parties evidently assumed that it was on or after it. Nor was this dispute as to whether the 14th of Nisan was on or before the full moon. Both parties evidently assumed that it was on the full moon; and in the presence of all this testimony, it is difficult to doubt that the crucifixion must have been on a full moon, as well as after the vernal equinox, and on the 14th of Nisan, and on a Friday. I shall now produce testimony as to the rule adopted by the Jews for the computation of the new moon.

Spencer, *De Leg. Heb.*, p. 806, says, "That the more ancient Jews held the custom of beginning the celebration of their new moon from the first appearance (*φάσις*) of the moon may be proved by testimonies, whose credit is not to be easily set aside. First, by the testimony of Philo, who, without doubt, specially held the custom of his country. These are his words, *Νουμηνία ἄρχεται φωτίζειν αἰσθητῷ φέγγει σελήνην ἥλιος, ἥ δὲ τὸ ἴδιον κάλλος ἀναφαίνει τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.*" Selden, c. xx., also says, "These words of Philo must be understood of the *φάσις*." Spencer goes on and says, "That Jews of a subsequent date held the same opinion, we learn from these words of Scaliger, 'In *Pandecte Digestorum Thalmudicorum*, cap. *Roshaschana*, it is clearly written that of old, the new moons were wont to be proclaimed from the *φάσις*,' *De Em. Tem.*, l. i., p. 99. With this agrees the testimony of Maimonides, *Kiddusch Hachod*, c. 5, s. 2, 'This is the order of Moses on Mount Sinai, that as long as the Sanhedrim lasted, they should order the new moons according to the phasis of the moon.' With this agrees the statement of some Apocryphal, but most ancient author, which Clemens Al., vi., 760, has rescued from the injury of time, as to the Jews, 'Except the moon appears, they keep neither the first sabbath nor the new moon.'" "But, if any one wishes to go more into this matter, let him consult Maimonides, *Kiddusch Hach.*; Abarbanel, *De Consecrat. Novilunii*;

Petavii, *Ad Epiphan.*, 151, 183; Petiti, *Eclog. Chron.*, i., 12; Bucherium, *De Pasch. Jud. Cyc.*; Selden, *De Jud. Anno. Civil.*; Bochart, *De Anim. Sacr.*, p. i., col. 562—4; Buxtorf, *in lib. Cosri.*, Per, 3, s. 18. In these authors it is proved by many testimonies that the Hebrews of old consecrated the new moons according to the appearance of the moon."

Selden, c. iv., says of Eliab ben Moseh, "But, he says, '*Our wise men have embraced the opinion, by which it is defined that the beginning of the new moon was from the time when the moon is seen after the setting of the sun,*' that is, after the end of the twilight, which follows the setting of the sun."

Sigonius, *De Repub. Heb.*, lib. iii., c. i., note xi., says, "The Jews reckoned their new moons, not from the conjunction of the moon with the sun, but from its appearance."

We have had from Spencer the testimony of Maimonides as to the fact that the Jews did order their new moons according to the appearance of the moon; we now come to his testimony as to the rule observed by the Jews in this matter. In his *De Consecratione Calendarum*, c. i., s. 3, Maimonides says, "The moon is hid every month, and not seen for about two days, a little more or less, one day at the end of the month before it comes into conjunction with the sun, and the other day after its conjunction with the sun. Then again, in the evening, it appears in the western parts. But, in the night, in which the moon is first seen after it has been hid, the beginning of the month is taken from it, and twenty-nine days are reckoned. For if the new moon is seen in the 30th night, that 30th day is the beginning of the coming month. But if the moon be not seen it is ascribed to the ending month; the next month begins from the 31st day."

According to Sir I. Newton's rule, the full moon must always have been on the 14th day of the Jewish month, but according to this rule of Maimonides, the full moon would sometimes fall upon the 14th and sometimes on the 15th day, depending on the hour of the conjunction. Thus, if the conjunction was at three in the afternoon, eighteen hours for the phasis would carry us to nine in the morning of the following day, and then the 1st of the month would begin at six in the evening of this day, that is, twenty-seven hours after the conjunction, and the complement of half a lunation to carry us on to the full moon would be 13d. 15h. 22m., that is, the full moon would be on the 14th day of the month.

						D.	H.	M.
After the conjunction	1	3	0
To full moon	13	15	22
Half a lunation	14	18	22

But if the conjunction was at three in the morning, then eighteen hours for the phasis would carry us on to nine in the evening, and according to Maimonides the 1st of the month would begin at the preceding six o'clock, that is, fifteen hours after the conjunction, and the complement of half a lunation to carry us on to the full moon would be 14d. 3h. 22m., that is, the full moon would be on the 15th day of the month.

						D.	H.	M.
After the conjunction	0	15	0
To full moon	14	3	22
Half a lunation	14	18	22

Nor should I omit to notice that on a further search into Philo I have found him, when speaking of the feast of unleavened bread, in his *De Septem*, p. 293, saying, "The 15th day, the middle of the month (δίχομενος), on which the moon is full (πλησιφαῆς γίνεται), begins the feast."

But according to Sir I. Newton's rule, the 1st day of the month in this last case would not begin before six on the evening of the day following the phasis, that is, 1d. 15h. after the conjunction, and the complement to carry us on to the full moon would be 13d. 3h. 22m., that is, the full moon would be on the 14th day of the month, as in the former case.

						D.	H.	M.
From conjunction	1	15	0
To full moon	13	3	22
Half-mean lunation	14	18	22

The true time of full moon would, of course, in some instances, cause variations from these illustrations, both on the one side and on the other. But notwithstanding this uncertainty of the full moon falling on the 14th or 15th of the month, the tradition of the Church points so strongly to the crucifixion having been at full moon, that we must surely find the full moon of that passover on the 14th of Nisan, as well as on a Friday.

In A.D. 29, according to Professor Airey, as stated by Mr. Pratt in your Journal, January, 1863, p. 416, the new moon in March was on Friday the 4th, at 2.26 in the morning, and we have seen that with a conjunction at this hour of the day the full moon would be on the 15th day, that is, after six p.m. on the 18th of March, and,

according to Professor Airey, the moon was full on Friday, March 18, at 9·26 in the evening. Thus, so far as the state of the moon is concerned, I could not deny that, according to the rule of Maimonides for the new moon, this might have been the full moon at the crucifixion; but, from Maimonides' rule as to the equinox and the tradition of the Church in respect to it, a full moon on March 18th could not have been a Paschal full moon, and, according to the rule of Sir I. Newton as to the new moon, this full moon on Friday, March 18th, at 9·26 p.m. must have been on the 14th of the Jewish month, which began at 6 p.m., and this would give Saturday, the 19th of March, as the day for killing the Passover and the crucifixion, and this would not suit Mr. Pratt. Thus, on every ground which I have noticed, the verdict of your readers must be that the crucifixion could not have been in A.D. 29.

I will now briefly notice that so far as the moon is concerned, the crucifixion might have been in A.D. 33. Toinard, *Harmon. Evangel.*, p. 83, gives the new moon in A.D. 33 as on Friday, March 19, at 53m. 7s. after mid-day, and with a conjunction at this hour of the day we have already seen that, according to the rule of Maimonides, as well as the rule of Sir Isaac Newton, the full moon must have been on the 14th day of the Jewish month, and on Friday, April 3, soon after six in the morning, and this was after the equinox, and so might have been the Paschal moon at the crucifixion. In your Journal for October last, Mr. Pratt also says in reference to the 15th year of Tiberius in Luke being reckoned from the death of Augustus, "But doubts on this subject do exist, and have long existed, among learned men; for the simple reason that it has been found impossible to make out the Gospel chronology satisfactorily on that hypothesis. It is but reasonable therefore to enquire whether St. Luke may not have computed this hegemony from an earlier epoch." That it is impossible to make out the prophecy of Daniel's weeks satisfactorily according to the common chronology, which comprises the period from the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus, who died in the seventh year of the Peloponnesian war, to the death of Christ, I do not doubt. I must, therefore, admit the reasonableness of an enquiry into this matter. It was this alone which led me to the study of chronology many years ago. Further, if there must be something wrong in the chronology of this period, and its portion A.D. be right, then there must be something wrong in its portion B.C., and I trust I have shewn as clearly that its portion B.C. is wrong, as that its portion A.D. is right, but I do not hold that its

portion A.D. is altogether right. By it St. Luke is represented as meaning that Jesus Christ began to be about thirty years of age at the beginning of His twenty-ninth year. I hold that Jesus Christ was born in the forty-second year of Augustus, as held by Epiphanius, Eusebius, Jerome, Orosius, Isidore, Bede, I. Malala, and Rabbi Ganz, and this would represent St. Luke as meaning that Jesus began to be about thirty years of age at the beginning of His thirtieth year. This would require that the consulship of the two Gemini, the year which we call A.D. 29 should be called A.D. 30, and that the year which we call B.C. 2 should be called B.C. 1, but this would not in the least affect any of the points at issue between Mr. Pratt and myself.

Luffingcott, November 5th, 1867.

FRANKE PARKER.

ON THE ACCESSION OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR AND THE ECLIPSE OF B.C. 585.

HERODOTUS'S account of the taking of Nineveh by Cyaxares and Labynetus, king of Babylon, seems very favourable to the notion that Cyaxares made himself master of the Assyrian metropolis before the Nabopolasar of Berosus had ceased to reign over Babylon; and, therefore, at least some three or four years before the accession of his son Nebuchadnezzar. This may be one among other reasons why some of those who accept the eclipse of B.C. 585 as that which is said to have been predicted by Thales, and to have terminated the Lydo-Median war between Alyattes and Cyaxares, assign cir. 582-1 to the commencement of Nebuchadnezzar's reign.

There are grave historical objections to this departure from the generally received Chaldean and Median chronology. According to Berosus, Nebuchadnezzar reigned forty-three years. On this view, if he ascended the throne cir. B.C. 582-1, he must have died cir. B.C. 538; about which year it may be considered almost historically certain that Cyrus took Babylon, and, finally, overthrew the Chaldean dynasty. And between the death of Nebuchadnezzar and the Medo-Persian conquest of Babylon, at least four kings reigned successively over Chaldea. Their united reigns amounted to not less than twenty-three years. If we add to these the forty-three of Nebuchadnezzar, there will be an interval of sixty-six years between the accession of that monarch and the capture of the Queen of the

Euphrates. Making every allowance for possible numerical errors on the part of transcribers, it will be impossible to reconcile the common Chaldean chronology with the hypothesis which assigns B.C. 582-1 to the accession of Nebuchadnezzar. If we follow Berosus, we shall think, without fixing on a particular year, that Nebuchadnezzar succeeded his father Nabopolassar earlier than B.C. 600; and as Nabopolassar was still reigning over Babylon when the Medo-Chaldean army took Nineveh, after peace had been made between Cyaxares and Alyattes, it would follow on this view that the Lydo-Median war cannot well be supposed to have ended *later* than cir. B.C. 605, twenty years before the eclipse of B.C. 585.

Yet some may hesitate to accept the authority of Berosus even on such a point as this. Let us therefore turn from the Chaldean to the Greek historian. It is fairly deducible from Herodotus that Darius Hystaspes ascended the Persian throne cir. B.C. 521, and about nine years after the accession of Cambyses. Thus we have cir. B.C. 530-29 as the date of the accession of Cambyses and the decease of the great Cyrus. This is within one or two years of the date which might be inferred from Ctesias. Now Herodotus tells us that Cyrus reigned twenty-nine years, and these are generally supposed to date from the overthrow of Astyages, which would thus have happened cir. B.C. 559. Astyages reigned thirty-five years, and this would give B.C. 594 as the date of the death of Cyaxares, nine years earlier than the eclipse of 585.

When we call to mind the great power, and the fierce and ambitious character of Nebuchadnezzar, we find it difficult to believe that he would not have resolutely interfered to prevent the Persian adventurer from overthrowing either Astyages or the Lydian Croesus. We rather suppose that his life and reign terminated before either of these events occurred. Herodotus tells us that it was the fear which Croesus felt of the growing power of Cyrus which led to the war between Persia and Lydia. Babylon, as much nearer Persia and Media, must have felt her jealous misgivings awakened at a still earlier period.

Some contend that the whole astronomical argument is in favour of our receiving the eclipse of B.C. 585 as that which was predicted by Thales, and which terminated the Lydo-Median war. May we not say that almost the whole historical argument is against this hypothesis, which assigns so late a date as B.C. 585 to the final cessation of hostilities between Alyattes and Cyaxares? If we appeal to a far higher authority than that of Herodotus or Berosus, we shall

find that the soundest and ablest commentators and expositors hold that the testimony of the Hebrew Scriptures is decidedly in favour of the view that Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne of Babylon, and Nineveh was overthrown, earlier than B.C. 600. The statement of Herodotus that it was a total eclipse which put an end to the Lydo-Median war, may be traditional exaggeration rather than authentic history.

G. B.

REV. XIII. 18.

“HERE is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man, and his number is six hundred threescore and six.” “ὥδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν. ὁ ἔχων νοῦν, ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου· ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ, καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ χξς’.”

The solutions hitherto attempted of the mystical number 666, of the Apocalypse, are to many persons unsatisfactory. I venture, therefore, to propose a solution which I believe to be new; and which rests both on ancient authority, and on modern discovery and research. “Berosus informs us that, in their computations of time, the Chaldæans employed an alternate sexagesimal and centesimal notation, reckoning the years by the Soss, the Ner, and the Sar; the Soss being a term of sixty years, the Ner one of 600, and the Sar one of 3,600 (or 60 Sosses). It appears from the Senkareh monument, (a tablet on which a table of squares is given from the square of one to the square of sixty), that they occasionally pursued the same practice in mere numerical calculations.” “The notation is by means of two signs, the simple wedge ∇ , and the arrow-head \prec . The wedge representing one unit, one soss=60, or one sar=3,600, according to its position; while the arrowhead expresses the decades of each series, the numbers 10, and the ner=600.”^a Rawlinson’s own account and estimate of Berosus may be read in the second vol. of his work, p. 285. “Berosus was one of the learned class or caste in Babylonia whom the Greeks called Chaldæans, and regarded as priests. He lived at the time of Alexander’s conquests; and shortly afterwards wrote the history of his nation in Greek, for the enlightenment of the masters of Asia. The early part of his chronology is exaggerated; his cosmogony is grotesque, and almost ludicrous;

^a Rawlinson’s *Ancient Monarchies*, vol. i. pp. 129—131.

idolatry; of Babylon, not only as a nation, but also as an idolatrous nation, worshipping the planetary host of heaven. One might even conjecture that it was the number symbolic of the god Bel himself. At any rate we read in Dan. iii. 1, "Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold, whose height was *threescore* cubits, and the breadth thereof *six* cubits;" and this particular height and breadth may have been chosen with reference to the symbolic number of the god.

And whereas the phrase in Rev. xiii. 18 is ἀριθμὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶ, "it is the number of a man," this may be interpreted to mean a number really used in human computation,—a mode of numerical computation among men; just as in Rev. xxi. 17 the golden reed which the angel had for measuring the city is said to have given the measurement in so many cubits, μέτρον ἀνθρώπου ὃ ἐστὶν ἀγγέλου, "according to the measure of a man, that is, of the angel;" as much as to say that, by these cubits, are to be understood the length commonly so called among men.

If, then, my explanation is correct, chap. xiv. 8 merely states plainly the name Babylon, which was already intimated in xiii. 18. Indeed xiv. 9, 11 so connect with Babylon τὸ χάραγμα τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θηρίου,—"the mark of the name of the beast," that my interpretation of the number seems to make all consistent and clear.

I take the beast, or Babylon, to stand for the power of pagan idolatry, as an Antichrist, and a persecutor of Christians,—the outward opponent over which the Christian religion triumphed under Constantine. And that Babylon should represent this, is consistent with the Old Testament figures of the whole book of the Apocalypse; Babylon being the great enemy, and the seducer into idolatry, of God's people of old.

Such is my induction. If it be thought worthy of notice, scholars competent to decide may be induced to consider and discuss it. And if it receive sufficient confirmation to be accepted as probably the true solution, it will shew that the wrong track has been followed hitherto in seeking for some name, such as Λατρινος, the numerical power of whose letters make up the number 666.

E. J. HILLIER.

Cardington Vicarage, Bedford,
November, 1867.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Philosophie et Religion. Par AD. FRANCK, Membre de l'Institut, Professeur au Collège de France. 1 vol. 8vo. Paris: Didier.

M. FRANCK has published under the above title a series of articles which appeared originally in the *Journal des Savants*, the transactions of the *Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, and other learned periodicals. To these essays he adds a disquisition never before printed, but which was read at one of the sittings of the French Institute. A volume thus composed needs not, for all that, be deficient in point of unity; and through the numerous topics discussed there may be, nay, there ought to be, if the author is at all to be trusted, a leading idea, forming, so to say, the keystone of the edifice, and in accordance with which the different works or authors introduced are strictly appreciated. Philosophy and religion: such are the two subjects examined by M. Franck *à propos* of Plotinus, of Moses Maimonides, of M. Salvador, and of M. Comte. In what relation does the one stand with reference to the other? What are their several rights? What are their probable destinies? No topics certainly can be more important, and it is always worth while ascertaining the conclusions at which a serious, truth-loving mind has arrived respecting them.

We shall here make a quotation from M. Franck's preface, "Notwithstanding the close resemblance and affinity of the problems which occupy them—problems as old as the human race itself, and which it will give up discussing only when it ceases to exist, religion and philosophy can only take the place of one another by repudiating their principles, and losing through that act of treason the rank they respectively occupy, without obtaining the one to which they aspire. To use the language of mathematicians, religion and philosophy are irreducible quantities."

Certain systems of philosophy have attempted to claim for themselves a kind of religious authority, and to lay down as articles of faith the ingenious speculations of a few wild dreamers. That has been the case with the Neo-Platonists, to whose extraordinary theories M. Frank devotes his first essay. Some years ago a French *savant*, M. Bouillet, had published an admirable translation of the *Enneads* of Plotinus, with a commentary, notes, excursions, etc. It is *à propos* of this work that our author endeavours to point out what

are the weak sides of a system of metaphysics which gives itself out as appealing to the heart as well as to the understanding. The philosophers of Alexandria, after sacrificing reason to mysticism, ended by superadding to mysticism theurgy. Then, through a contradiction which would seem unaccountable, if we did not know the deplorable weakness of human reason, these hierophants pretended to maintain and defend as a metaphysical system, that is to say, as a theory to be grasped by the understanding, a scheme which included the power of working miracles, of doing certain actions and bringing about certain results which set the understanding at defiance. The Alexandrine philosophers lived a life of illusions; one of their fondest and maddest dreams was that of destroying the *prestige* of Christianity by throwing new life into the old mythological traditions of Greece, and for a short time they hoped that the support which Julian the Apostate gave to their views would secure to them a permanent triumph.

That is not all. If a thinker accepts Pantheism and the principle of unity of substance as the true solution of this world's mysteries; if, besides, he ascribes to himself in the name of theurgy the power of working miracles, he will be led, as a natural conclusion, to believe that the whole universe is under the dependence of the human will, and that when a philosopher is initiated into the secrets, the arcana of the only true doctrine, he must *ipso facto* be able to alter according to his own pleasure the various substances which are around him, to transmute them, and to reduce them all into one primary element. Such is the origin of alchemy, a science well worthy of being noticed, both because, as we have just stated, it represents an aberration of the human mind, and because it has resulted in the beautiful discoveries of modern chemistry. The relations between mysticism and alchemy form the subject of M. Franck's second essay, in which he examines more specially the life and doctrines of Saracelsus.

We have hitherto considered metaphysics in their tendency to overstep the bounds of man's intellect and to assume the character of a religious creed. Let us now inquire for a few minutes into the reverse proposition; after dealing with mysticism, let us direct our attention to rationalism. One of the most satisfactory representatives of that line of thought is undoubtedly Moses Maimonides, the celebrated author of the *Ductor Perplexorum*. Here again, M. Franck had the advantage of being able to take for the starting point of his remarks an admirable work, Mr. Munk's annotated translation of the great treatise which has rendered Maimonides so justly illustrious.

Some of our readers may perhaps remember that we have already given an account of it in a previous number of this Journal; we shall therefore simply remark here that the *tour de force* which the Jewish Rabbi sought to accomplish consisted in accommodating to the Scriptures of the Old Testament the doctrines of the Stagyrte as interpreted by the Arabs. Moses, the judges, the patriarchs, the prophets, God himself became excellent Peripateticians in the hands of Maimonides. The doctrine of Creation alone excepted, the Word of God is transformed into a manual of Aristotelic philosophy.

M. Salvador's works are the next reviewed by M. Franck. With them we step at once from ancient to modern times, from the rationalism of the middle ages to the free thinking of the nineteenth century. M. Salvador is a Jew who firmly believes that he has discovered the religion of the future, and who takes, as its basis, the writings of the Old Testament explained from the point of view of Pantheism. But, as M. Franck observes here, between the theology of the Hebrew Scriptures and Spinoza's doctrines there is an abyss which nothing can bridge over. You cannot combine, you must choose. "The God of the Bible, both of the Old Testament and of the New, is the living God, the personal God, the Creator, the God free, all-powerful, and therefore spiritual; for the spirit alone is above the blind forces and fatal laws of nature. The immortality which the Scriptures teach us, is that of the human person, of the *ego*, of a soul which remembers that it has existed, and feels responsible for its works. The resurrection of the body (I simply explain the principle, leaving to others the care of defending it) is nothing else but the doctrine of responsibility extended from the soul to its instruments. Do not then try to persuade us that pantheism and metempsychosis, or if you prefer other names, infinitheism and the transmigration of souls, are the most complete expression of the sacred books.

The majority of sober-minded thinkers, who aim at finding a substitute for the worn out (as they fondly imagine), tenets of Christianity, do not deny that religion is an essential element in the constitution of society; their error is that they believe metaphysics to be convertible into a religious system. They want to found a "rational and progressive religion established upon the data supplied to us by reason." M. Franck has no difficulty in refuting this paradox. "With the free use of reason," says he, "we may found a system of philosophy, we shall never create a religion. Religion and philosophy are two things essentially distinct from each other; they correspond to

two completely different states of the human soul. If you attempt, either to blend them together, or to connect them by a relation of subordination, you destroy them both. Philosophy claims the fullest freedom, because its fundamental condition is that it never yields, except to evidence. . . . Religion, on the contrary, submits only through faith, that is to say, it requires dogmas and mysteries. For religion, truth is not a painful discovery made by man, it is the free gift of God."

M. Franck goes on to shew that external worship, which is an essential part of religion, springs naturally from it, and that it cannot be created *ad libitum* in consequence of any preconceived idea, were that idea ever so praiseworthy, ever so useful. When it is not the spontaneous expression of faith, it becomes degraded, so as to be a vain sight, like the famous procession of the National Convention on the day when the worship of the Supreme Being was inaugurated. Then there is prayer; what shall we say about it? We quote once more M. Franck's apt remarks:

"Refuse to prayer all efficacy on the Divine Will, all influence over the destinies of man, spread abroad the conviction that it is merely a form of meditation and an auxiliary of teaching, immediately people will give up prayer; or rather, no; in spite of you and of your doctrines, men will pray, they will pour out their grief at the throne of the Lord of the universe: they will ask grace and help from 'our Father who art in heaven.'"

To this vain compromise between religion and philosophy, attempted in the name of so-called progress, we far prefer unblushing atheism. When we have to deal with a man who does not believe in God, we know on what ground we are standing; there can be neither equivocation nor mistake. Auguste Comte was one of these: his avowed intention was to eliminate Christianity altogether; not only Christianity, but every theory resting upon any other data besides those supplied by science. Philosophy, he said, must disappear, and leave the arena free to the realities of the visible world. But we must notice here, in the first place, that Positivists take for granted what is quite untrue; far from its being the case that metaphysics and the inductive sciences are irreconcilable enemies, the smallest acquaintance with history will shew us the greatest metaphysicians in those illustrious thinkers who have done most for science. Aristotle, Descartes, and Leibnitz may be named as instances. If, however, it is wrong to represent metaphysics and the inductive sciences as in a state of antagonism, it

is too true, on the other hand, that empiricism will have nothing in common with the doctrine which proves the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and which believes in the glorious ideas of duty, freedom, and responsibility. The mistake is that this antagonism has been represented by some as quite a new thing, the most recent manifestation of the theory of progress, whereas it is as old as philosophy itself; a new name has been given to it, that is all; and the empiricists of the nineteenth century parade themselves about under the banner of Positivism.

Unfortunately many people will never take the trouble of thinking for themselves, and even amongst would-be Positivists not a few are apt *jurare in verba magistri*, without ascertaining whether the conclusions they adopt are legitimate or the reverse. To such persons we would venture to recommend the perusal of M. Franck's chapter, entitled *La science n'est ni positiviste ni athée*. They will see in that excellent morceau what they must think of a system which discards as unscientific both abstraction and hypothesis. The abstract exists quite as much as the concrete, the general as the particular. Every property is represented in our mind by a general or abstract idea; and as for hypotheses, where is the science which consists exclusively of demonstrated propositions? When we have had to account for the phenomena of light, heat, electricity, and magnetism, is it not hypothetically that we have described the causes of these phenomena as residing in imponderable fluids? All investigations which aim at setting aside *a priori* principles end in chaos. M. Franck illustrates this view by a reference to the famous dispute on the origin of species and on spontaneous generation.

We wish we had time to go more minutely into the various essays which make up M. Franck's interesting volume. Of course we do not profess to indorse all the opinions they contain; for instance, we are far from admitting that religion and mere philosophy are two roads which will take us with equal safety to the great truths which it behoves us most to know. But what we admire in M. Franck is the sound appreciation he gives of religion itself. He may think metaphysics quite as trustworthy: he will never pervert them into a doctrine appealing to our faith. Especially is he strong on the necessity of tearing off the mask from the atheism of the nineteenth century, and there we join most heartily with him. The sarcasms of Voltaire, the coarse ribaldry of d'Holbach and Diderot, were not half so dangerous as the maudlin sentimentality of Renan, and the scientific calmness of

Hegel and his disciples. The error which pretends to speak in the name of freedom, conscience, and progress, will be sure to attract the unwary, and to throw them off their guard. It requires, therefore, to be repelled with the greater energy, and whilst we would ever remember the laws of personal courtesy, we must give no quarter to what we know to be error.

Port Royal. Par C. A. SAINTE BEUVE. Third edition, 6 vols., 18mo, Paris and London : L. Hachette and Co.

THE prince of modern French critics, M. Sainte Beuve, had published nearly thirty years ago the first volume of a history of Port Royal; we have now to announce a third edition of the same work, revised, corrected, augmented, and in every respect deserving the most serious attention. We surely need not introduce to our readers the accomplished author of the *Causeries du Lundi*, the Bayle of the nineteenth century; but it may be perhaps as well to say a word or two here of the particular gift which makes M. Sainte Beuve so pre-eminently the first in the realms of critical literature. That gift is not style, although much might be said on the originality which stamps our author's writings; nor is it perhaps any particular amount of erudition. It is the extraordinary facility with which M. Sainte Beuve places himself at the standpoint of the persons whose character he examines, entering into their opinions, their tastes, their prejudices, understanding at once the influences amongst which they move, and the principles they endeavour to carry out. M. Sainte Beuve assimilates himself, if we may so say, to the nature of those with whom, for the time being he keeps company; he is in turn a disciple of Lamennais, a Calvinist, a mystic, a Saint Simonian, a positivist; when he studies Port Royal he almost becomes a follower of Saint Cyran, and a champion of La mère Angélique. So strongly sympathetic a nature is seldom to be met with, especially in the ranks of journalism, and the question might perhaps be raised, whether the peculiar eclecticism which distinguishes M. Sainte Beuve is always compatible with fixed and well defined views on the fundamental axioms of moral and religious truth; but without stopping to discuss so important a problem, without especially having the slightest intention of applying it to the author of Port Royal, we shall proceed at once to give a short account of this interesting work.

We must notice, in the first place, that the title Port Royal does not perhaps express very adequately the nature and contents of the volumes

before us. They treat, no doubt, of Jansenism chiefly and immediately, but not exclusively. Pascal, for instance, suggests Montaigne; Racine must not be forgotten; Saint Cyran brings in Balzac, Corneille comes in led by Arnauld; without much effort we can digress about Saint François de Sales, Count Joseph de Maistre, and even M. de Lamartine. We are far from complaining of these excursions right and left, and we are too thankful whenever M. Sainte Beuve chooses to throw fresh light for our benefit on any point of literary history; but at the same time it must be said that his Port Royal is a history of Jansenism *cum multis aliis*. He compares it somewhere, himself, to a church where the main subject forms the nave and chancel, whilst a number of small chapels distributed all along the aisles represent the digressive chapters.

It may be as well to say here that the work we are now noticing has arisen out of a course of lectures delivered at the academy of Lausanne. During the summer of 1837, M. Sainte Beuve, already occupied with the idea of writing a history of French Jansenism, was travelling in Switzerland; he expressed one day to a friend the regret that the occupations of a Paris life did not allow him to devote his time exclusively to the task he contemplated. Very shortly after he received a proposition to give a course of lectures on a subject with which he seemed so familiar; the offer was accepted, and the elements of the book were thus speedily brought together. The inaugural address delivered by M. Sainte Beuve, originally published in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, is reprinted at the beginning of the first volume of this edition as it was in the two former ones, and, besides, a few notes given in the appendix detail all the circumstances of the author's position as lecturer, shewing us also who were his colleagues, and how his audience was made up.

The first book entitled *Origine et renaissance de Port Royal* takes us from the earliest times to the year 1636, when Saint Cyran assumed the authority of spiritual director in the monastery. There is here plenty to interest us and to awaken our attention. The famous *Journée du Guichet*, as it is called, where in her ardour of reformation, *La mère Angélique* refused to open to her own father the doors of the convent, would be enough by its dramatic character to stamp this part of the book as one of the most remarkable. Then, as if to make a pleasant contrast with the grand but austere person of Saint Cyran, we have Saint François de Sales, the amiable prelate, the writer whose imaginative style sometimes becomes faulty through an overgrowth of tropes

and metaphors. The conflict which Angélique Arnaud had to carry on with herself when she decided upon keeping aloof from her family, would naturally remind us of the famous scene in Corneille's *Polyeucte*. Whether, however, the dramatic poet was at any time of his life acquainted with Port Royal is a matter which is more than doubtful, and the parallel drawn by M. Saint Beuve, although extremely ingenious, does not go so far as to demonstrate that *Polyeucte* was ever intended as a direct allusion to the conversion of *La mère Angélique*. Corneille's religious tragedy once introduced leads our author to examine other works of the same kind; Rotrou comes under notice with his *Saint Genest*, and thus, strange to say, two entire chapters on dramatic literature form part of the history of a society of Christians who considered the stage as a school of vice, and who denounced playwrights and actors as almost beyond the pale of salvation.

But, silence! here comes M. de Saint Cyran with the whole tribe of the first solitaires,—M. Le Maître, M. de Séricourt, M. Singlin. A companion of Jansenius himself, his close associate in every plan of reform and renovation, M. de Saint Cyran strikes us as one of the noblest representatives of the seventeenth century. Unfortunately, he found himself face to face with another great character, equally stern, equally uncompromising—Cardinal Richelieu. A reflection made by Louis XIII., whilst perusing a devotional book written by Séguenot, the Oratorian, seemed to the overbearing minister like a sign of independence on the part of the feeble monarch. Séguenot was shut up in the Bastille, and Saint Cyran, named as being his friend, was sent to Vincennes. He recovered his liberty only after the death of the Cardinal.

Five years of captivity must be hard to bear for any one, and it is said that at first the Jansenist doctor felt completely disheartened; but he soon recovered his usual peace of mind, and from the room which he occupied at Vincennes he managed to exert over his followers an influence and a control which Richelieu himself could not check. M. Singlin, M. Lemaitre de Sacy, Antoine Arnaud, form the cortège of M. de Saint Cyran, and arrange themselves naturally around that eminent spiritual guide. Each of them has his appropriate nook in M. Saint Beuve's gallery of portraits, but a distinct chapter is reserved for that most illustrious of all Port Royalists—Pascal.

What has not been written about Pascal? M. Cousin, M. Faugère, M. Villemain—the leading critics both in France and abroad have endeavoured to analyze the character of that extraordinary man; it

seems as if no writer thought that he had justified his own claims to wield a pen, if he did not bring his stone to Pascal's *cairn*. Out of all these appreciations and sketches, M. Sainte Beuve's must be, we think, considered the most satisfactory, and in every way the most complete. The *Pensées* and the *Lettres Provinciales*, the philosopher and the believer, the admirer of Montaigne and the humble, self-denying Christian, are brought before us. We fancy we are in a sculptor's studio, and see a beautiful bust or statue so placed that every possible effect of light and shade is brought to bear upon it. *Statue*, did we say? We meant group; for side by side with Pascal we find his two sisters, Madame Périer and that admirable Jacqueline who died because she would not prevaricate or deviate by one hair's breadth from the strict truth.

The Port Royalists have for a long time enjoyed great reputation as educators—Lancelot, Tillemont, Walon de Beaupais; Nicole himself may be named amongst those who devoted their energies, directly or indirectly, to the important duty of training the young; and on that point, quite as much as on questions of doctrine, did the spirit of antagonism arise between him and the Jesuits; accordingly we find M. Sainte Beuve heading one, his fourth book, with the title *Les Ecoles de Port Royal*. Take Calvinistic doctrines in their quintessence, free grace, absolute predestination, and all the consequences which derive from these premisses, and you see at once what grandeur they cast around the person of the humblest teacher. M. Sainte Beuve quotes, in one of his notes, a terrible passage from Bossuet's works on original sin and the natural corruption of the human heart; then, by way of contrast, he transcribes the famous opening sentence of Rousseau's *Emile*:—"Tout est bien sortant des mains de l'auteur des choses; tout dégénère entre les mains de l'homme." Of the pessimist view and of the optimist one, which, after all, is the most really correct? It is all very well to talk about our being at our birth in the best conditions of happiness, but Rousseau is obliged to retract, or at any rate to qualify his assertions; and we find him very soon reduced to speak of our weakness, our helplessness in language quite as strong as that of the Latin poet:—

"Tum porro puer, ut sævis projectus ab undis
Navita, nudus humi jacet infans."

Is it not better at once to acknowledge the truth, humiliating though it may be, and to do our utmost, with a view of counteracting the natural evil disposition of our heart, and correcting, by careful training, the

results of the fall? All persons engaged in education ought to read over and over again the portion of M. Sainte Beuve's interesting work entitled *Les Ecoles de Port Royal*. They would see there how, under the constant influence of Christianity, both the soul and the mind can be properly disciplined, and how the most enlightened views of teaching, the most thorough acquaintance with the various branches of science and literature, are perfectly in accordance with the strictest piety. How often do we hear well-meaning but narrow-minded persons denouncing every kind of intellectual accomplishment in the name of Christianity, and believing that ignorance is almost a sign of divine grace! Let such individuals see what men like Lancelot and Nicole did for the cause of true learning; let them ascertain what rank the Port Royalists occupy in the catalogue of schoolmasters and writers of school books.

The second generation of Port Royal, as M. Sainte Beuve calls it, next comes under consideration. To the colossal figures, if we may so say, of Saint Cyran, Singlin, and Pascal succeed the more accessible characters of Hamon and Nicole. With these two men we feel quite at home—they are almost on a level with us; the sentiment they inspire is one of confidence and love, not of fear. What a wonderful portrait our author gives us of Hamon—that pattern of humility—that physician both of the soul and of the body, who, with talent and learning enough to push on his way in the world, preferred the solitary groves of Port Royal, and the employment of waiting upon the poor and the destitute! The whole range of biographical literature contains few more touching pages. And Nicole—Nicole the ingenious moralist, the elegant writer, the philosopher whose essays so delighted Madame de Sévigné, that she would have had all her friends get them by heart.

When we read the wonderful story of Port Royal, when we consider what a centre of light and of holiness it had pleased God to establish in that community, we envy the monarch under whose reign such things took place, and who could number amongst his subjects such true Christians. Surely he will surround them with his protection, encourage their efforts, and endeavour to spread throughout all his kingdom the influence for good which they exert in their immediate neighbourhood. . . . No; we are all acquainted with the real story—we know how, by the advice of the Jesuits, Jansenism was persecuted in France, and Port Royal utterly destroyed.

M. Sainte Beuve has devoted a final chapter to a few true-hearted persons who, notwithstanding all the efforts of the civil authority,

maintained to the last the principles which Saint Cyran and his coadjutors had learnt from the study of the Bible; at the same time he very wisely lays down his pen just before the epoch when the mad pranks of the *convulsionnaires* and the miracles of the '*diacre Paris*' had given a ridiculous character to what was, in the first instance, a serious attempt at a reform in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church.

With its notes, appendices, quotations, and helps of every kind, M. Sainte Beuve's history of Port Royal, in this third and much-improved edition, is a work which ought to be universally read.

L'Oratoire de France au xvii^e et au xix^e siècle. Par le P. Adolphe Perraud, prêtre de l'Oratoire, professeur d'histoire ecclésiastique à la Sorbonne. Paris: Douniol.

IN our biographies of the chief members of the French Oratory, we have had the advantage of consulting, amongst other valuable books, the excellent work of Father Perraud; it is only fair, therefore, that we should give here a short notice of a volume to which we are so much indebted, and upon which we shall often have again to draw for information.

Suppressed at the time of the Revolution along with the other religious communities, the Oratory, under its new form, exists only since 1852. The first care of the members was, as one would naturally suppose, to labour diligently, and thus to prove that they were not unworthy successors of the Malebranches, the Simons, the de Bérulle. Now that they have conclusively established their position, and given signs of unquestionable energy, they can proceed to answer the queries put to them by the world, and to explain how the Oratory of the nineteenth century hopes to take up and continue the tradition of the older congregation.

In the prosecution of this task Father Perraud has had to overcome several difficulties, which he enumerates in his preface. First of all, there was the necessity of being very brief, and of giving rather a sketch of the history of the *Oratoire* rather than the history itself. This is particularly noticeable in the chapter devoted to the Cardinal de Bérulle. To those readers who are acquainted with the labours of that remarkable man, both as an ecclesiastic and as a diplomatist, even the two volumes of M. Tabaraud's biography seem almost too short; what must it be when these have to be cut down to a few pages? It is the same with Malebranche. Where M. Blampignon gives us an octavo, Father Perraud can only afford one single chapter.

The second problem which our author had to solve consisted in remaining strictly impartial, whilst, at the same time, suppressing none of his strong sympathies for the order to which he belongs. Earnest adherence to truth should never serve as a pretext for indifference of feeling; and here we certainly think that no fault can be found with Father Perraud.

The part where we differ *toto cælo* from the author we are noticing is the first chapter, entitled *Religious Consequences of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*. Nor could it be otherwise. Father Perraud places himself at the Roman Catholic standpoint, and considers Protestantism as an unmitigated evil. For him, as well as for all those who belong to his Church, the ecclesiastical question is the cardinal one, and carries along with it everything else. We believe, however, that coming events will speedily prove the fallacy of such a view. In the presence of the ever-increasing forces of atheism and infidelity of the grossest kind, true-hearted people cannot but see that all those who agree about the great doctrines of Christianity must join together in a compact against their common foes, and, waiving points of minor importance, they will acknowledge the imperative necessity of giving to one another the right hand of fellowship. We Protestants can cordially admire the virtues, the self-sacrifice, the heroism of a Francis Xavier, a Saint Bernard, a Lacordaire, without sharing all their views on theological questions; why should not our fellow-Christians of the Romish Church at last be led to confess that Luther and Calvin, Wesley and Whitfield, had also an important duty to perform in the history of Christianity, and that, instead of being responsible for the free-thinking movement of modern times, they were, in point of fact, the true champions of Christian truth?

Father Perraud gives us a short account of the life of Philip Neri, the founder of the Italian Oratory. It is an interesting study to consider all the efforts made during the sixteenth century, in various quarters and from various points of view, for the reformation of the Church and the reconstruction of an order of things which had sunk to the lowest degree of corruption and iniquity. Philip Neri belonged to those stirring times which produced an Ignatius Loyola, a Theresa of Avila, a Vincent de Paul, a Melancthon, a Luther. Like those devoted saints, he sacrificed himself completely for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. "I will have," he used to say, "not one hour, not one single moment, that I can call my own." Imbued with the true missionary spirit, Philip Neri applied all his energies to the education

of the young, and gathered together around himself a band of pious followers who thought it right to sanctify their everyday work by prayer and other religious exercises.

"They were wont," says Father Perraud, "to begin by reading aloud; then one of the brethren, standing up, commented on the passage and answered the questions that might arise from it. This conversation being finished, another brother, in an elaborate discourse (*elaborato sermone*), related, from the most trustworthy authors, the examples of Christian life given by the saints, selecting especially those calculated to bring out in strong relief the fundamental truths of Christianity. In order to refresh the mind of the hearers after the exposition of these great truths, one of the brethren (it was Baronius), was entrusted with the duty of describing in succession the most memorable facts in the history of the Church. Finally, another member of the association paraphrased the life of some saint. Before they separated, they used to sing spiritual songs, composed with the greatest care for those meetings. Then, when a short prayer had been pronounced, every one returned to his usual occupations. Each day these exercises took place in the same order, and the number of hearers never diminished."

Such were the beginnings of the congregation of the Oratory. This establishment encountered, as is often the case, considerable opposition on the part of other religious communities, who fancied that their privileges were interfered with, and their special line of duty ignored. Pius V., however, encouraged by every means in his power the rising congregation, and finally, in the year 1575, Pope Gregory XIII., by his bull *Copiosus in Misericordia Dominus* canonically erected it. We must notice here that the Oratory is not and never was an *order*, as this word is generally understood. No vows were taken, but merely a small number of easy rules laid down, which each individual freely accepted so long as he continued a member of the society. Philip Neri thought that there were already religious communities in sufficient number to meet the cases of those persons who aimed at serving God in tying themselves down by solemn vows. Such was also the opinion of the Pope, in his bull of institution: "Nos omnino volumus ut perpetuo in Ecclesia Dei talis congregatio presbyterorum secularium reformatorum absque ullo voti ligamine perseveret, quandoquidem non deerunt quamplures religiones pro eis qui earum spiritu tenentur."

Of the life of De Bérulle, the founder of the French Oratory, we shall say nothing here, as we intend devoting a separate article to him in another number of this Journal. We would just remark that his

endeavour to introduce into France the kind of society established by Philip Neri met with the most complete success. The very constitution which the founder had selected, the comparative freedom enjoyed by the members, and the whole economy of the statutes, could not but point out the Oratory as a centre of action for those persons who, though still acting under the influence of Christian principles, were more inclined than others to think for themselves, and to apply their attention to metaphysical problems, to science, and to sacred criticism.

An Oratorian of the seventeenth century has left us a very curious description of the congregation to which he belonged. In a conversation between two friends, Amyntas and Theodosius, he explains the system according to which the association has been made, the objects it has in view, and the duties of those who join themselves to it.

“Our rules,” says one of the interlocutors, “are very few, and have for their object merely to maintain uniformity amongst us; as the spirit which animates us is that of Jesus Christ, so the thoughts and maxims of Jesus Christ contained in the Gospel are our rule, therefore the study of the New Testament is strongly recommended to us. We should carry it about with us as our most valuable relic, and as the finest mark of our religion. We are to read every day a chapter of it on our knees, and bareheaded. Those who cast in their lot amongst us are taught to consider the Gospel which relates to us the life of Jesus Christ, and brings before us His actions and His words, as the pattern according to which we should shape ourselves, by expressing in our manners and conversation what we find there. . . . This house has always had a great fondness for polite learning. . . . When there is in our community a man of a penetrating and comprehensive disposition, who has a rare genius for sciences, he is set free from every other occupation, and we think that he cannot render greater service to the Church than by studying. It is important that there should be persons consummate in science, qualified to meet the difficulties of beginners: their decisions should impose trust, and be accepted as conclusive: they must be ready to combat heresy, either *vivâ voce*, or by writing. We are allowed to follow the special inclinations we may have for certain sciences, but our great study is that of Church discipline, of the Holy Scriptures, the Councils and the Fathers. We are inspired with much love for truth. In our private studies we are not compelled to endorse any particular opinion, and to see things exclusively from the point of view of that opinion.”

No one will deny that the rules we have just quoted are extremely liberal, and there are few persons, we think, who would not subscribe

them most heartily. Nor is it any exaggeration to say that to the consummate wisdom which actuated both Philip Neri and P. de Bérulle in framing the constitutions of the Oratory, the Church owes the labours and the genius of men such as Malebranche, Richard Simon and Quesnel—men who are the glory of Christianity, and to whom Protestants as well as Roman Catholics look up with feelings of deep veneration.

The chapters devoted to the old Oratorians we shall pass over for the reasons already mentioned, and we shall in our concluding remarks take a glance at the portion of the book entitled *L'Oratoire Moderne*. Father Perraud describes the Oratory as a kind of Church Pastoral Aid Society, intended to supply parishes with curates, districts plunged in ignorance and sin with missionaries, schools with teachers, over-burdened clergymen with active and energetic *collaborateurs*. So useful an institution was particularly called for during the sixteenth century, when discipline had almost disappeared, and when the noble fabric of the Church was half eaten up by the thorns and briars of corruption. We may say boldly that, for totally different reasons, the field of usefulness thrown open to the oratorians of the nineteenth century is quite as wide as it was three hundred years ago. Formerly, as Father Perraud remarks, the mission of the priest in the midst of society was accepted without distrust, and no one would have thought of questioning the authority enjoyed by spiritual teachers over the conscience of their parishioners. Now, even the most sacred things are made an object of dispute, and the teaching of the Church quite as much as the rest. The most humble country curate is liable to be contradicted by so-called *esprits forts*, and a great many would refuse to acknowledge the claim of his ministry. The doctrine of equality has so often been preached, that no more homage is rendered to the superiority of the sanctuary than to that of rank or of fortune.

Here the Oratory comes in, and exercises its influence most usefully. From the private studies, where its members devote their time and their strength to the Scriptures and to intellectual cultivation in all its branches, scholars sally forth thoroughly furnished with spiritual weapons, whereby they may overcome infidelity, and confirm in the faith those who have allowed themselves to be led astray. Side by side with the scientific teaching they give in the lecture-room, they address from the pulpit truths less abstrusely put, and which appeal to the heart more than to the mind. At the present time, when men live fast, and when the continual pressure of business seems to hurry us along with the violence of a whirlwind, we have no leisure to devote to the polished

and long-winded sermons of other days. Parliamentary eloquence has accustomed us to close reasoning and to evident conclusions. No preliminaries, no rhetorical embellishments; simplicity, precision, clearness, a lucid and perspicuous statement of doctrinal points,—such are the qualities required in a modern preacher. Let him cherish a thorough detestation of mere phraseology: he should be strong, and his strength should be derived from a perpetual meditation of the Holy Scriptures. There is the secret of his influence.

It has been for some considerable time the fashion to cry down what is generally called profane science, as being often positively dangerous, whilst it is *always* useless to a minister of God's word and sacraments. Father Perraud refutes this objection, and has no difficulty in proving that it arises from a mistaken idea of what science ought to be. If we would resist the rapid progress made just now by the various schools of infidelity, we should meet them on their own ground, and it is impossible for us to do so unless we are likewise versed in the mysteries of natural and metaphysical science.

To conclude, if we except the part in which Father Perraud treats of Protestantism and of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, this new volume on the French oratory seems to us extremely well done, and full, not only of interesting facts, but of valuable suggestions.

G. M.

The Jewish War of Flavius Josephus. With his Autobiography.

A new translation. By the late Rev. ROBERT TRAILL, D.D., M.R.I.A. Edited, with notes, etc., by ISAAC TAYLOR, Esq. London: Houlston and Wright.

THIS is certainly a superior version of an Author often talked of but too little really read. It ought to supersede Whiston's, which contains many gross blunders, and the monotonous style of which has made the Jewish historian, whose main drawback is monotony, still more dry. Yet so interesting is the matter recorded, so indispensable to the advanced knowledge of all that illustrates the New Testament requisite in the present day,—that if any author deserves to have justice done him, it is Josephus.

Dr. Davidson is surely in error when he undervalues Josephus as an illustrator of the *language* of the New Testament, while he does him justice as an illustrator of customs and rites. Although the diction of Josephus savours occasionally of Thucydides, and other ancient writers, he often uses isolated expressions which strikingly recall the inspired Word. And in his description of institutions

and characters he throws a fuller light by the use of words. Thus in Acts xxi. 20 "zealots of the law" is better understood from the definition of "zealots" in *Jewish War*, iv., c. 3. We need hardly refer to Simon, called Zelotes in Luke vi. 15. Josephus illustrates the use of *παρρησία* (v. 1) in the case of Zacharias, son of Baruch, who "did not allow despair of life to deprive him of liberty of speech" (*τὴν τοῦ ζῆν ἀπογνώσιν οὐκ ἀπαρρησιάστον*). *Βιάζομαι*, Matt. xi. 2, is illustrated in *Jewish War*, iii., 7, 33, the verb being *passive*, though it is often found on a deponent. In Gal. ii. 6 the *δοκοῦντες εἶναι τὶ* is illustrated in the *Jewish War*, iii., c. 9, 8 *οἱ—προὔχειν δοκοῦντες*, where the expression is given in full. Instances might be multiplied to a large amount. How invaluable in other illustrations Josephus is it is unnecessary to say. The destruction of the herd of swine, into which the legion of devils entered, was quite in accordance with the feelings of abhorrence with which swine were regarded. This we know; but it is not the less interesting to read in iv., 5, 3, "when these (Ananus and Joshua) were dispatched, the zealots and Idumæans attacked and butchered the people, as if they had been a herd of unclean beasts" (*ἀνοσίων ζώων ἀγέλην*).

Rom. i. 27 is illustrated by *Jewish War*, iv., 9, 10. In this work there is a dissertation on "The Personal Character and Credibility of Josephus," the "Life," seventy-five excellent engravings on steel, a chronological summary, with other information in an appendix. It would have been better, perhaps, if the dates had been given concurrently, instead of being placed at the end of such a large and somewhat cumbrous volume. In another edition the Greek text might, in some obvious places, be differently translated, the MS. being apparently corrupt. Thus, in the preface to the *War*, Paret, a German translator, observes that in § 8 the number of auxiliaries with which Vespasian devastated Judæa is evidently the meaning of Josephus, not the number of auxiliaries cut off. The verb was active, and has been corrupted into a passive. Again in chap. i. 1, all Syria (*ὅλος*) should be hollow Syria (*κοῖλος*). At all events there are points worthy of notice and discussion at the end of the book, or, at least, of a simple query, which would not occupy much room, and would render more complete a very welcome work. W.

The History of Israel to the Death of Moses. By HEINRICH EWALD.

From the German. Edited, with Preface, by R. MARTINEAU, M.A.,
London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

ENGLISH writers have levied frequent contributions upon the great

Göttingen professor's book ; but many must have felt with us that it was most desirable some of his untranslated works should be placed, in their entirety, before those who could not read German. *The History of Israel* is one of those compilations which the world might profit by, and certainly if it does not make, it marks, an era in the study of Jewish history. But the whole work is voluminous, extending over seven tomes, which no intelligible translation could reduce in bulk. We are therefore fain to content ourselves for the present with the instalment before us, coming down to the death of Moses. It is no part of our duty to write the panegyric of Dr. Ewald—he needs none ; “his own works praise him.” Of course, however, we claim the liberty granted by all modern rabbis, in theory at least, not blindly and beforehand to pledge ourselves to all the views and conclusions we may have submitted to us. Traditionalism may not stand a good chance of defending itself before criticism ; but, nevertheless, all that is traditional must not be thrown to the winds, because there may be in it good corn as well as chaff. If criticism went no further than winnowing, as it does not necessarily, it would not be so often condemned as destructive—as a very Abaddon in the domain of belief. People are made very unhappy by the destruction of the old and honoured beliefs, and they are made very unhappy by any serious alteration of them—nay, by their simple purification. Do we mention this as a reason why old notions should not be meddled with or imperilled, if not in harmony with truth ? By no means ; let all notions, whether true or false, or an amalgamation of both, be sifted and tested, that the true may stand and the false perish.

Now, Dr. Ewald's work does three things—it confirms some of our ancient opinions, it rectifies others, and some it utterly condemns. The tendency of the author to be strictly didactic will occasionally make his readers restive ; but he speaks so calmly, so confidently, and with so much judgment and learning, that second thoughts may lead to patient hearing and unprejudiced examination both of his sayings and his reasons.

The volume now in our hands has been carefully edited by a gentleman of known ability, and the translation, which is by two hands, seems performed in a scholarly manner. After mentioning the design of his work, the author considers the sources of the early history in a long and very elaborate disquisition, of which we can merely indicate the landmarks :—1. The story and its foundation—tradition ; 2. Commencement of Hebrew historical composition—writing ; 3. History of Hebrew historical composition—i. The great book of origins (Penta-

teuch and Joshua); ii. The great book of the kings (Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings); iii. Latest book of general history (Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther). This important section covers the whole historical portion of the Jewish canon. The third section deals with the chronology of the ancient history, and the fourth with its territory and peoples. Thus far, all is introductory; but now we enter on the record itself. Book I. narrates the history of Israel to the migration into Egypt. Book II. exhibits the theocracy, or the period from Israel's settling in Egypt to the death of Moses. The last book necessarily touches upon and examines questions of the greatest importance; but the reader will be much assisted, as elsewhere, by the admirable arrangement of the materials. In all this volume we see so much to commend that it will be a very ungrateful task if we undertake to enumerate our objections. But we do not receive many of the principles laid down by our learned author, whose theology is not always the same as our own, and whose views of the structure, authorship, and date of certain books we have not yet accepted. We have, for example, never seen our way to the belief that the "redaction" of the Book of Deuteronomy took place in the second half of Manasseh's reign; the evidence for that belief being so fragmentary, shadowy, and arbitrarily arranged, that it rather puzzles than convinces us. This is one of the points where the dead weight of tradition has a reason, not merely for our respect, but almost to the name of history.

However, Dr. Ewald's opinions are known to many, and have been received, more or less, by many, and we are exceedingly glad that in the volume we have before us, multitudes will be able to study those opinions in the most favourable circumstances. We greatly admire and revere the author without calling ourselves of his school, and we feel quite sure that all who think with us will readily and largely profit by the perusal of this excellent volume.

Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets: Lectures delivered to Students for the Ministry on the Vocation of the Preacher. Illustrated by Anecdotes, biographical, historical, and elucidatory, of every order of Pulpit Eloquence, from the great preachers of all ages. By EDWIN PAXTON HOOD. London; Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.
The Pulpit Analyst. Edited by JOSEPH PARKER, D.D.. Vol. II. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

THESE two massive volumes bear the names of ministers of the Congregational body, and their appearance may be regarded as significant

just now. A good many of the clergy have imbibed the opinion that sacerdotal functions should occupy their supreme thoughts, that liturgy and ceremonial, and especially sacramental rites, are the chief occupations to which they are called. Whether right or wrong, they see the ministers of a large and powerful body of Nonconformists developing schemes for giving the pulpit greater influence and attractiveness. These last take St. Paul's exhortation to Timothy as their motto—"Preach the Word"—and, like George Herbert, make the pulpit their joy and their throne, because they believe that preaching is the chief agency for converting sinners and edifying Christians. But the former plead for an emblematic and symbolical service as that which God has most distinctly mentioned and appointed. If the example of our Lord and his apostles goes for anything, the advocates of preaching have a good plea in their favour. There is no doubt that preaching is a divine institution, and the only question is how to render it most efficient. It is admitted that the universities do not recognise it as they might: homiletics, and pastoral theology, and kindred subjects are not much taught there, and, indeed, very little is done to cultivate and develop the faculties required, in order either to pulpit eloquence, or the skilful reading of offices and lessons. The Dissenters pursue a different course, and their students are instructed in what concerns them as future preachers, while books often appear designed to aid still further those who are already in the work of their ministry. We naturally, and with good reason, prefer the course these pursue. On the one hand, the duty of preaching is imposed by Divine authority, and on the other, good preachers have advantages which other men cannot have. God's messenger to men should not speak with a stammering tongue; and we find, in fact, that even where sacerdotal claims are highest, an eloquent preacher is followed by the multitude. It is so in France, for instance, where the few notable preachers of the Romish Church are singularly popular. If gorgeous ceremonial can afford to depreciate the pulpit, it is, nevertheless, helped by it; and where there is no ceremonial, the pulpit is of paramount importance—is, indeed, a fountain of life and health or of sickness and death.

Mr. Hood's volume is often quaint and odd, but it contains a multitude of facts and lessons of great utility. There are fourteen lectures on as many topics, and nine of them are accompanied by notices of great preachers, from St. Paul to Lacordaire and Mr. Binney. The examples and illustrations are drawn with impartiality from all sources, so that the reader gets information of every possible kind. The well-

known essay of Claude, with the notes and other appendages by Robert Robinson, used to be a book of mark ; but it contained so much extraneous and even offensive matter that it has fallen into oblivion. We could mention many other books, but we are disposed to believe that, for the simple work and matter of preaching, we are not able to point to one so appropriate to our day as that of Mr. Hood. He is himself a preacher of unusual originality and power, and being, moreover, a profound thinker and a facile writer, he has the qualifications for compiling a volume, which students and preachers may consult with profit.

The other work, *The Pulpit Analyst*, appears in monthly parts, and the year's issues form a volume of over 700 pages. It contains sermons, analyses of Scripture, outlines of sermons, translations, book notices, biographical sketches, extracts, etc. The book is a storehouse to which the poor preacher and the distracted one may resort for assistance—a museum where specimens of pulpit work may be seen and studied. We believe the publication to be one of great utility, and we earnestly recommend both it and that of Mr. Hood to the attention of our readers

The Analogies of Being, as embodied in and upon this Orb, shewn to be the only inductive Base of Divine Revelation, and from which is now defined and laid down the Cardinal Laws and Primary Relations of Relative Being, through which alone God reveals Himself, enthroned in the Temple of Infinite Being. By JOSEPH WOOD. London : F. Farrah.

THIS is a strange book—strange alike in matter and in manner ; so much so, indeed, that we do not pretend to have mastered it. Speaking of “functions which take place in the vital economy of the celestial temple of Infinite Being,” Mr. Wood says :—“The first function will commence immediately after the region of hell and the bottomless pit will have had cast therein that ordained portion of the terrestrial stellar universe which had been then located against the valve or entrance-gate of hell: coeval with this function being in vital operation the entrance-gate of hell (the tricuspid valve) communicating with the rest of the impure portion of the terrestrial universe will have become shut ; the exit-gate of hell (the semi-lunar valve), communicating with the region occupied by the diverse ramifications of tubular vessels which permeate and traverse the lake of fire and brimstone (analogous to the human lungs), will be open ; and the entrance-gate of heaven (the tri-

cuspid valve) will be closed." The style of this sentence will shew what the reader has to expect, and why we lay aside the volume in despair.

Miscellaneous Essays (Second Series). By Rev. W. KIRKUS, LL.B.
London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

MR. KIRKUS wields a ready pen, and his versatile genius has the double advantage of abundant information and an exhaustless flow of words. His ideas are always expressed with clearness; and whether novel, as they often are, or already recognised, as they must needs sometimes be, there is no question of the writer's meaning. Speech was certainly not given to this man to conceal his thoughts; but occasionally, as when something specially problematical or provocative escapes him, we wish it had been. Equally ready in politics and philosophy, literature and theology, he treats of them all, and whether we agree or disagree with what he says, we are interested, and set thinking. He does not always convince us—in fact, does not always try to do it, but launches his thoughts, and leaves them to do their work. Much that is pleasing to everybody is scattered over his pages, and yet, with heroic indifference to what men may say of him, he is not cautious to employ diplomatic language. He has the unfortunate habit of calling a spade a spade, and he is prone to do so when most people would call it something else. Prone to sarcasm, he shews no mercy to what he regards as shams and abuses wherever he encounters them, and whatever the repute or reverence with which some regard them. Everywhere intensely personal, he proclaims the largest toleration and the most unlimited freedom of thought, speech, and action, provided men are sincere and earnest in seeking to know and do the right and true.

Of the essays in this volume we cannot speak at length. Most of them have already appeared in various journals, and some in this. The first, on satire, is clever and useful. The second, on Froude's Elizabeth, is friendly, but discriminating and suggestive. That on convict management is practical and good. The one on model sermons should be read by ministers, not only for the directly professional hints it contains, but for the somewhat original views it embodies respecting various schools of preachers. This essay was originally printed in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* for July, 1864; the next, on Ritualism, also appeared in our pages so recently as last April, and will be fresh in the memory of our readers. "Romanism, Anglicanism, and Evangelicalism logically identical," is reprinted from the *Fortnightly Review*, and is a

very ingenious essay in the characteristic style of the author: it is certainly one of the ablest in the volume. The New Reformation, by which Mr. Kirkus means the great movement which is going on in men's minds in favour of investigating the grounds and reality of our religion, is, according to his view, founded in rationalism. What rationalism is, in his opinion, he is careful to explain, and in general we understand him to signify that it is the testing of religion by reason. The last essay is on John Stuart Mill, of whom Mr. Kirkus speaks in tones of high commendation. The volume is, as a whole, one of undeniable power, and one of the best the author has produced; perhaps it is the best.

The Divine Revelation: an Essay in Defence of the Faith. By C. A. AUBERLEN, Ph.D., D.D. With Memoir. Translated by A. B. PATON, B.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THIS work opens with an interesting memoir of the author, to which we add the fact that he died on the 2nd of May, 1864, at Basle, being only in his fortieth year. The author had projected a series of volumes of an apologetic character, but did not live to complete his plan. One volume appeared before his death, in 1861, and a second posthumous publication came out after his decease, in 1864, containing what he had done towards his two next volumes. He was deeply and justly lamented by the orthodox parties in Germany, as the writer of the memoir reminds us:—"What he proposed in this work was substantially to shew the history of the revelation God had given and superintended to be *real* history, and then to shew it to be *rational* history." His plan was a grand one; and, so far as he lived to execute it, we have abundant reason to think highly of the performance. The book abounds in wise and profound observations, nor can we imagine that any will consult it without profit. The Messrs. Clark are rendering great service just now by their prudent selection of works, but we believe none of them is more fitted for immediate usefulness than this, which we have great satisfaction in introducing to the notice of the English reader.

The Life and Reign of David, King of Israel. By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D., F.A.S. London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer.

No character in the Bible is more savagely attacked by infidels than that of David, and Dr. Smith might have enlarged his volume in its defence; but controversy was not his object, and he has therefore pro-

duced a book in which a proper understanding of the history, character, and experience of the king is aimed at from a religious point of view. The whole work is executed in an excellent spirit, and the closing chapter on the religious and political character of David, and the results of his reign, 'is especially worthy of attention. A good many of the Psalms are introduced in connection with the record of the circumstances which called them forth.

Messiah the Prince: or the Inspiration of the Prophecies of Daniel. Containing Remarks on the Views of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Desprez, and Dr. Williams, concerning the Book of Daniel, together with a Treatise on Sabbatical Years and Jubilees. By J. W. BOSANQUET, F.R.A.S. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

SUCH a volume as this ought to have an extended review instead of the short notice to which we are confined. On several accounts we regret that we can only intimate a few of Mr. Bosanquet's opinions, and in general terms strongly recommend his work to all students of the Book of Daniel. He regards the antiquity of the book as demonstrated, and scarcely expects any new argument in favour of lowering the date to the second century before Christ; yet he seems to think it not unlikely that the book has been interpolated. He supposes that the Darius of Daniel was Darius, son of Hystaspes; but he is fully alive to the chronological difficulties of the book. He accepts the Messianic interpretation of certain portions. Though not agreeing with Dr. Pusey on some points, he recognises the great merit of his work; and though controverting some of the views of Dr. Rowland Williams, he owns the probability of others. His chronological calculations and researches are of a very elaborate description, and his conclusions will sometimes startle the reader who only looks for vague and indefinite results. If he has really shewn that the seventy weeks, for instance, begin and end at the dates he adopts, he will surprise some who deny the really prophetic character of the Book of Daniel, for they terminate at the very birth of Christ.

The Holy Child: a Poem in four cantos. Also, *An Ode to Silence, and other Poems.* By STEPHEN JENNER, M.A. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

THE poems of this volume are carefully written; they are full of thought, and will bear comparison with the best examples of recent poetry. The subjects of the lesser pieces are diversified, including a good number

which have a marked religious character. We cannot say that all are equally excellent, but, speaking of them as a whole, we have much pleasure in awarding them a high meed of praise.

Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. By F. DELITZSCH, D.D. From the German, by James Martin, B.A. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THE second volume of this excellent commentary will be found very useful to the Biblical student. The author adheres firmly to the opinion that the second portion of the Book of Isaiah (chap. xl.—lxvi.) belongs to the prophet, and not to some later writer. Free use is made of the labours of those that preceded, but the work is to be characterised as an independent contribution to literature by one who is a scholar of a high order, and who thoroughly sympathises with the religious element, as well as with the strictly prophetic and Messianic features of the book.

Manual of Hermeneutics for the Writings of the New Testament. By J. J. DOEDES, D.D. From the Dutch, by G. W. Stegmaun, jun. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

OF the manual of Dr. Doedes we cannot say less than is said by the translator:—"If it is not calculated to supersede any of the existing treatises on the subject, it will at any rate afford the student the means of obtaining a clear and more concise view of the subject than is offered by any other compendium at present in general use." The name of Professor Doedes is not at all unknown to students, although this appears to be the first book of his that has been translated into English.

The Dogmatic Faith: an Inquiry into the Relation between Revelation and Dogma. In Eight Lectures. By EDWARD GARBETT, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

MR. GARBETT is one of the champions of the orthodox faith; and although his opinions on some points are carried further than our own, his lucid and earnest utterances always command our admiration. The subject of the lectures contained in this volume are—The Faith and the Church; the Historical Faith; the Religious Sentiment; the Faith and the Intuitions; Dogma and Speculation; Christianity and Civilisation; Consciences and its Relation to the Faith; and the Obligations of Belief. There is much sound and wholesome, not to say seasonable, thought in the book, which merits a much longer notice than the irresistible pressure upon our space will allow. We can only commend it to the earnest attention of our readers.

Sermons by R. S. C. Chermiside, M.A. Edited by Rev. G. RAWLINSON, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

THE genuine and unostentatious character of these sermons shews that their author was a wise and useful teacher, and a good man. The fact that Mr. Rawlinson edits the volume will recommend it more forcibly than our praise, but we remind the editor that *Requiescit in pace* is as good Latin and as good divinity as *Requiescat in pace*.

Memorials of English Martyrs. By Rev. C. B. TAYLER, M.A. New Edition. London: Religious Tract Society.

THIS new and revised edition of Mr. Tayler's *Memorials of English Martyrs* is an elegant one, beautifully printed and illustrated. The illustrations are chiefly of localities with which the martyrs, whose records appear in this volume, were associated. It is a very instructive book to read; and now that some are very energetic in denouncing all Protestant martyrs as bad men and mere felons, it is a plain matter of duty that the truth should be diligently made known. To call the Marian martyrs merely political offenders and villains is an easy method of libelling the Reformation, but a very discreditable one.

The Apostolical Canons, in Greek, Latin, and English. With Notes. Edited and translated by the Rev. J. MACNALLY, A.M., LL.B. London: Bagster and Sons.

THE Greek text of this useful little book is that of the Paris edition of Zonaras (1618), but we think more use might have been made of other materials. We are also of opinion that some of the Greek phrases are not rendered so closely as they ought to have been. Finally, we are not satisfied with the ante-Nicene date assigned to the canons, which, as we have them, we consider more modern. The notes are good.

Basilides, am Ausgang des Apostolischers Zeitalter; als erster Zeuge für alter und autorität Neutestamentlicher Schriften, insbesondere des Johannisevangeliums, in Verbindung mit andern Zeugen bis zur Mitte des Zweiten Jahrhunderts. Von P. HOFSTEDE DE GROOT, Leipsic.

PROFESSOR DE GROOT has sought a wider sphere of usefulness by issuing this edition of his essay in German. He regards Basilides as having lived from about 65 to 135 A. D., and views his testimony to the Gospels as consequently very important. A good many other

early witnesses are adduced by the author, whose object resembles that of Dr. Tischendorf in his now famous pamphlet, with which this may be properly associated.

The Apocryphal Gospels and other Documents relating to the History of Christ. Translated from the originals in Greek, Latin, Syriac, etc. With notes, Scriptural references, and prolegomena. By B. HARRIS COWPER. Second Edition. London: Williams and Norgate.

THIS second edition differs in no important features from the first, which has been simply subjected to some verbal corrections. If the demand for it increases, further notes may be added, and it is the editor's intention to publish the remaining Christian Apocrypha in the form of Acts, Epistles, and Revelations.

The Natural History of the Bible: Being a Review of the Physical Geography, Geology, and Meteorology of the Holy Land; with a description of every Animal and Plant mentioned in Holy Scripture. By H. B. TRISTRAM, M.A., F.L.S., etc. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

MR. TRISTRAM has done a good work, and one for which we thank him, in compiling this volume. Whatever may be found in recent Bible dictionaries, and elsewhere, we know of no manual before this which we can honestly recommend. But now, in a compact and yet comprehensive book, we have a mass of facts accurately stated, by one who writes of what he understands. Every school, parish, and family library should possess it, and indeed all Christian people will be wise to have it at hand when they read the Scriptures, and would know what they mean. By way of specimen we give an extract from the article "Wolf," p. 153:—

"The habit of the wolf in seeking its prey after sunset is frequently alluded to: 'A wolf of the evenings shall spoil them' (Jer. v. 6). 'Their horses . . . are more fierce than the evening wolves' (Hab. i. 8). 'Her judges are evening wolves' (Zeph. iii. 3). In several other passages the treacherous and cruel opponents and persecutors of the truth are compared to wolves: 'Her princes in the midst thereof are like wolves ravening the prey, to shed blood, and to destroy souls, to get dishonest gain' (Ez. xxii. 27). 'Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves' (Matt. vii. 15). In our Lord's commission to the twelve apostles, he says: 'Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves' (x. 16). In his charge to the seventy the same figure occurs: 'Behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves' (Luke x. 3). And in St. Paul's address to the churches at Miletus: 'I know this, that

after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock" (Acts xx. 29).

"The wolf is now, as of old, the dread of the shepherds of Palestine. Not so numerous, but much more formidable than the jackal, he lurks about the folds, hunting not in noisy packs, but secreting himself till dark among the rocks; without arousing the vigilance of the sheep dogs, he leaps into the fold and seizes his victim by stealth. When encamped in a glen in north-western Galilee, we were often startled by the discharge of firearms at intervals through the night, and, on enquiring the cause, were told by the shepherds that they fired in order to frighten any wolves that might be prowling near the fold, undetected by the dogs. A single wolf is far more destructive than a whole pack of jackals, who always betray their presence, and who can only carry off any silly straggler. I never heard of the Syrian wolf hunting in packs, as wolves do in winter in Russia and the mountainous districts of Europe, and was told by the shepherds that there are seldom more than two or three together. Probably the mildness of the climate, which never drives them from their mountains, and the facility with which they can obtain food, may account for this.

"Their boldness is very remarkable. When camping at desolate Moladah, on the southern frontier of Simeon, I had one evening wandered alone three or four miles from the tents; in returning before sunset I suddenly noticed that I was followed at an easy distance by a large tawny wolf. The creature kept about two hundred yards behind me, neither increasing nor diminishing his distance. I turned upon him, when he too turned. In vain I endeavoured to close with him, for he always exactly accommodated his pace to mine. We continued respectively to advance and retreat without coming to close quarters. The wolf's evident intention was to keep me in sight *until evening*, when he hoped to steal upon me in the darkness unperceived. He never uttered a sound of any kind, and walked as if quite unconscious of my presence. When it was nearly dark, I found him rapidly closing upon me, and thinking him within shot I halted, when he, too, stood looking at me. I drew my charge, slipped down a ball, and took deliberate aim without his moving. The bullet struck a rock between his legs, and then he turned and trotted very quietly away.

"In every part of the country we occasionally saw the wolf. In the open plain of Gennesaret my horse one day literally leapt over a wolf, which started from under the bank of a narrow ditch I was crossing, but allowed us to leap before he started, when he ran with all speed across the plain. He was, no doubt, secreted under the bank, which was certainly not more than three feet in depth, waiting, wolf-like, for an opportunity of seizing his victim out of a herd of cows and calves, which were grazing, in charge of a Bedouin boy, not one hundred yards farther on. In the hill-country of Benjamin, about Bethel and Gibeah (Jib), the wolves still ravin. We found them alike in the forests of Bashan and Gilead, in the ravines of Galilee and Lebanon, and in the maritime plains.

"The Syrian wolf is of a lighter colour than the wolf of Europe, being a pale fawn colour, and seems to be a larger and stronger animal, probably from its being better fed. The natives speak of a still fiercer black wolf, which they call *sheeb*; but this I never saw, and believe that it is only a darker coloured wolf of the ordinary species, and perhaps an old solitary male. It is no doubt the *Canis lycaon* of naturalists.

"The wolf (*Canis lupus*) extends over the whole northern hemisphere, excepting in a few countries where it has in modern times been extirpated."

The Four Gospels in the Second Century. By B. H. COWPER. London: printed.

THE six letters here collected were reprinted separately from the "National Reformer," in which they were controverted by "Iconoclast" (Mr. C. Bradlaugh). The discussion arose out of an assault by "Iconoclast" upon Dr. Tischendorf's essay on the Gospels; Mr. Cowper undertaking to shew that the argument of the essay was capable of verification, and had been assailed on inadequate and unjust grounds. The letters were reprinted separately, and, although not regularly published, have been extensively circulated among working-men in the metropolis.

Dæmonologia Sacra; or, A Treatise of Satan's Temptations. By RICHARD GILPIN, M.D. Edited, with Memoir, by Rev. A. B. GROSART. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

RICHARD GILPIN died in 1700, and appears to have been one of the last of the old Puritan school. His editor, who is very zealous, is also rather eccentric, and to that circumstance we probably owe the reprint before us. There is much of wisdom and of piety in the book, but not a little that is as obsolete in theology as it is in science. To some it will be useful, but we must rather consider it ourselves as belonging to the curiosities of literature. Fancies in Justin Martyr, Clement, and Origen, are not to be estimated as the same fancies in Richard Gilpin. We are quite sure that only the smallest possible minority among us now believe, with Mr. Gilpin, on the details of Satanic operations.

The Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Galatians. With a Paraphrase and Introduction. By SIR STAFFORD CAREY, M.A. London: Williams and Norgate.

THIS is altogether a well designed and well executed book, and one which will be valuable to all careful readers of the important epistle of which it treats. The introduction is copious, without being wearisome, and is at once discriminating and instructive. The Epistle itself is printed from the text of the ordinary version, with occasional suggestions. The paraphrase is so framed as to express more fully, and in other words, the mind of the apostle.

The Eucharistic Doctrine of Holy Scripture and the Primitive Liturgies: remarks on the Real Presence, Commemorative Sacrifice, Absolution, and Ritualism. By W. MILTON, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

THE real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist is, in one sense, objected to and argued against by Mr. Milton, who, on this and the other topics of his small book, shews himself earnest, acute, and well informed. We are profoundly sorry such subjects should need to be discussed within the Church of the nineteenth century.

On Miracles and Prophecy; being a Sequel to the Argument of the "Bible and its Interpreters," with some minor notes. By W. J. IRONS, D.D. London: J. T. Hayes.

THIS book is simply a sequel to the *Bible and its Interpreters*, by the same author. The principles of the first are further applied in the second, and notes are added. Dr. Irons must be careful lest, in his endeavours to exalt the authority of that vague quantity the Church, he should give a handle to infidels, who have not been slow to turn his former volume to account. We differ from him on more points than we have room to intimate, but we admit that he says many excellent things.

In the notes upon the *Bible and its Interpreters*, Dr. Irons says:—

"It is obvious that the literary difficulty in ascertaining the authenticity and genuineness of the Old Testament is very leniently dealt with, when we give the literary believer the benefit of the fact that all our Hebrew Scriptures come to us now, *de facto*, as one collection. If we push the argument, however, to its legitimate limits, we must ask of the rejector of the Church's position a clear account of each book of the Hebrew Scriptures, by itself.

"No one can read the late criticisms, both German and Dutch, with which M. Renan is making the French reader familiar, without perceiving the impossibility of modern English orthodoxy shutting its eyes to the progress of literary Christianity, if Christianity it may be still called. But no more urgent reason than this can be found for shewing at once that our own religious position as Churchmen is beyond the reach of such attacks; and this is what our present argument does, and no other argument even attempts it."

Here follows a table in which Dr. Irons more definitely suggests the nature of the task which the literary Christian undertakes when he demands a critical foundation for the Divine word. We omit the table, for which the sceptics who publicly oppose Christianity ought to be very thankful to the author of it, and are so.

There is a certain amount of self-complacency in the language of Dr. Irons, which suggests that he supposes he is more rich in faith

than the literary Christian, whom he pities. If we may judge by the eagerness with which infidels avail themselves of the array of items in the table, which we omit, infidelity is nearest in affinity to those who exclaim, "Hear the Church." It is, therefore, with stolid indifference that we thus read at the end of the table :—

"Now the Churchman has none of these difficulties. While he is quite ready to benefit by any one's critical discoveries, and to join very heartily in them, he knows that the divine Word stands for itself, speaks for itself, has its evidence for itself, and its interpretation in the Church from age to age. Whatever be man's judgment of any part of the letter used by the Spirit, the truth taught to patriarchs, prophets, apostles, saints, and doctors, comes uniformly to the Church from Him, who may at any time use the weakest things of our human literature to confound things mightiest; yea, and 'things that are not, to bring to nought the things that are.' Thus, 'all things are ours,' whether they be of Moses, or any other prophet,—or of Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or even of the world; things past or present, or to come—'all are ours,' for we are CHRIST's Church, and CHRIST is God's."

Remoter Stars in the Church sky. Being a gallery of uncelebrated Divines. By G. GILFILLAN. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

WE readily admit that some of these divines are uncelebrated, but not all; for in particular regions the names of Dr. Croly, Thomas Spencer, John Morell Mackenzie, and Robertson of Brighton are celebrated enough. However, the book is very interesting as a whole, and we have much pleasure in recommending it to notice.

Infinite Love; a Meditation. By Εκ βουλος Βασανιστης. London: Williams and Norgate.

THE author of this meditation concludes that :—"as His infinite justice demanded no lesser atonement for the sins of men than the sacrifice of His only Son, so nothing short of the final restoration and perfect happiness of the whole human race through Christ, without distinction of creed, sect, or party, will satisfy the requirements of His infinite love."

Post-mortem Examination; or, What is the condition of the disembodied human spirit? By D. BIDDLE, M.R.C.S. London: Williams and Norgate.

MR. BIDDLE maintains that at the resurrection we shall awake, perhaps millions of years hence, without being conscious that an hour has elapsed since our death.

A Catholic Christian Church the want of our time. By J. J. TAYLER, B.A. London: Williams and Norgate.

WHATEVER "Catholic" means, we do not believe it synonymous with "sacerdotal;" but we believe it at least includes "all that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." These are already in the Catholic Christian Church recognized by Almighty God; but whether it will ever be possible to induce them all to combine and co-operate is a doubtful problem. Mr. Tayler writes thoughtfully and well, and if he does anything towards relaxing the rigidity of party bonds he will not have written in vain. But we do not imagine for a moment that his generous endeavours will find favour with the majority.

A Plea for Theology as the completion of Science. A Sermon. By J. HANNAH, D.C.L. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons.

A VERY valuable discourse delivered at Dundee during the recent meeting of the British Association.

The English Bible: How to read and Study it; with aids thereto. By W. CARPENTER. London: Heywood and Co.

THIS is a useful little manual for the people by a veteran in Biblical studies.

The Kiss of Peace: or England and Rome at one on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. By a Fellow of ——— College, Cambridge. London: J. T. Hayes.

IF the argument of this book is sound, we do not see why there should be any great obstacle to the union of the Church of England with that of Rome. But we fear the reasoning is better adapted to lead English clergy over to Rome than to bring Rome to reconciliation with England.

The Order for the Unction of the Sick, according to the use of Sarum. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: J. Masters.

THE "Uses" of Sarum, Hertford, etc., were ordered to be destroyed under Edward VI., but a few copies escaped, and now much value attaches to them as means to the restoration of things as they were before the Reformation. To us this little "Order" is simply a curiosity.

Tracts for the Day. Nos. 6—9. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY.
London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

THESE tracts are intended to propagate the principles of the party which is termed ritualistic. They are generally written with ability, but of course take ground very different from what we were formerly accustomed to regard as that of the Church of England. No. 6, on "Casuistry," is curious; and No. 9 on "Popular Rationalism," is even more so.

Conciliengeschichte. Nach den Quellen bearbeitet von Dr. C. J. HEFELE.
Vol. VI. Freiburg im Breisgau.

WE must record the progress of this great and important work, the present volume of which reaches from A.D. 1250 to 1409. So far as we know, there is no other work on the subject which can bear comparison with it.

Eusebii Cæsariensis; Demonstrationis Evangelicæ. Libri I.—X. Recognovit C. DINDORF. Leipsic: B. G. Trübner.

THIS cheap and correctly printed volume is uniform with the two containing the "Evangelical preparation" of the same author. The set will be a real boon to scholars who are acquainted with their utility.

Lay Suggestions on Modern Preaching and Preachers. London: Rivingtons.

NOT at all an untimely or superfluous production, and one which all preachers may read with advantage. There is matter enough in this pamphlet to supply thought for a volume.

The Saints' Happiness: Lectures on the Beatitudes. By JEREMIAH BURROUGHS. *A Strange Vineyard in Palestina: an Exposition of Isaiah v. 1—7.* By NEHEMIAH ROGERS. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

THE two works in this volume of Nichol's Series of Commentaries are by men who stood in high repute two centuries back, and whose name and fame are not even now forgotten. Burroughs, however, is best known of the two, while Rogers is one of the obscurer Puritan worthies in our day; indeed, the Exposition now published seems to be the first edition of it since 1623. Both works are at once curious, interesting, and fitted to be useful.

The Increase of Faith. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons.

THIS is a very good book,—on an important subject. The author writes clearly, soberly, and religiously, and altogether in a style fitted to sustain the interest and command the sympathy of his readers. He explains the nature of faith, shews how it may be increased, and maintains that personal assurance of salvation is possible. The last point is often needlessly obscured by authors, who fail to perceive that the consciousness of believing is naturally followed by an assurance of being in the state of salvation. We strongly recommend the volume as well worthy of attentive perusal.

Joel: a Translation in Metrical Parallelisms, according to the Hebrew Method of Punctuation; with Notes and References. By A. C. ROWLEY, M.A. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

A VERY elegant little volume, comprising a preface, a new version, and notes. The version sometimes represents the etymological as well as the actual sense of words, and is therefore based on a principle which could not be safely carried out in popular translations, for we all know how utterly men lose sight of etymologies in their employment and application of words. The notes are some of them very good, though we do not subscribe to them all—*e.g.*, that the Hebrew *chalak* is related to our word “glass,” and the Greek *κολαξ*, a flatterer. This sort of philology is out of date.

Everlasting Punishment not Everlasting Pain. By R. REYNOLDSON. London: E. Stock.

THE author’s doctrine will commend itself to some, but we think his reasonings often inconclusive and his scholarship at fault. We cheerfully admit that he has confirmed us in our own view, that whether future punishment be unending pain or not, it will be in accordance with infinite and eternal justice.

The Immortality of the Intellect. A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, on the Death of the Right Hon. the Earl of Rosse. By J. H. JELLETT, B.D. Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co.

THE very interesting and important topic of this discourse is ably dealt with, considering the very narrow limits to which its author was confined.

MISCELLANIES.

PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE TIMES."

SIR,—I have the honour to forward some further reports from Lieutenant Warren, R.E., exploring for the Palestine Fund in Jerusalem, in continuation of my former letter of the 26th of September, and in so doing I am much grieved to have to say that I fear these may be nearly the last which I shall have to ask you to publish. The funds of the society are all but exhausted at the moment that Mr. Warren's strenuous and able labours are beginning really to tell. Briefly to sum up his discoveries, the details of which will be found in his reports, Mr. Warren has established, by actual demonstration, that the south wall of the sacred enclosure, which contained the Temple, is buried for more than half its depth beneath an accumulation of rubbish—probably the ruins of the successive buildings which once crowned it, and that if bared to its foundation the wall would present an unbroken face of solid masonry of nearly 1,000 feet long, and for a large portion of that distance more than 150 feet in height; in other words, nearly the length of the Crystal Palace, and the height of the transept. The wall, as it stands, with less than half that height emerging from the ground, has always been regarded as a marvel. What must it have been when entirely exposed to view? No wonder that Prophets and Psalmists should have rejoiced in the "walls" and "bulwarks" of the Temple, and that Tacitus should have described it as *modo arcis constructum*.

The question immediately occurs, What does the lower part of the structure formed by this enormous wall contain, our present knowledge being confined to the existing level of the ground? Of this I can at present say nothing, though the passage discovered by Mr. Warren 30 feet below the "single gateway," and described by him under October 22nd, promises to lead to important discoveries. The valley west of the Temple (Tyropœon) turns out to be very different in form from anything hitherto supposed—viz., tolerably flat for the greater part of its width, with ample space for a "lower city," and suddenly descending close below the Temple wall to a narrow gully of great depth. The well known arch discovered by Dr. Robinson, the centre of so many speculations, may thus prove to have been only a single opening to

span this gulley, instead of the commencement of a long bridge or viaduct. The minor researches related by Mr. Warren, at the aqueduct below the Coenaculum, the Virgin's Fount, the Hospital of St. John,—I pass over, not to occupy your space. I sum up by recording the important fact that his discoveries have completely changed the conditions of research in Jerusalem. They are nearly equivalent to the discovery of a new city. Hitherto we have explored the surface, or at most the vaults and cisterns immediately below it. We must now go far deeper, and penetrate those mysteries which the kind earth has entombed and preserved for centuries for the advantage of our generation.

I am well aware that discoveries of the kind I have named are barren and uninviting to the majority of readers, even to many who are keenly interested in the Holy Land and Holy Writ. They find little in them to throw direct light on the lives which they so cherish, and every detail of which they so dearly prize. True: but it must be recollected that exploration in Jerusalem is at present in the condition of a puzzle or joining-map of which only half-a-dozen pieces are found out of 60 or 70. Find the others, and the whole can be put together, and will then be intelligible enough. Extend to other parts of the city the researches here begun, and the sites of the Temple, Calvary, the Holy Sepulchre, the pool of Bethesda, will be problems no longer. I may therefore, with good reason, beseech all who are interested in Biblical studies to give their aid to the Palestine Fund for this work. This society is no private enterprise. The Queen is our patron. The Archbishop of York is our president. The committee contains some of the most eminent names in science, literature, education, and religion. Our accounts are regularly audited. Our investigations are conducted by gentlemen of proved ability and energy. Lieutenant Warren's letters speak for themselves, and it is unnecessary to say a word in commendation of the remarkable zeal and intelligence of himself or his assistant, Sergeant Birtles. The Fund has been in existence two years, and, under all the difficulties of a first enterprise, we have succeeded in making an Ordnance survey of 2,300 square miles, in obtaining 340 photographs, and in making the discoveries which form the immediate subject of this letter. In this work £3,242 have been expended—a sum which no one conversant with the subject will think extravagant. I entreat the public of England not to let it drop. Mr. Warren estimates his expenses at £200 a month for six or eight months. £1,500! What is this to raise in England from the very large number of persons who take an interest in researches bearing so directly

on the illustrations of the Bible? If Mr. Warren is obliged to relinquish his operations, not only will his shafts fall in and his trenches fill up, but the Arabs, whom he has trained to work so well, will go back to their old habits of indolence, and the whole process will have to be gone over again, if, indeed, it is ever again attempted. But it will not be relinquished. I cannot believe that an undertaking which has so many points of attraction to archæologists and architects, as well as the religious public, can be allowed to fall through.

Of the other parts of the society's operations—the geology and natural history—important as they are, I will not now speak; the archæological department being so much more pressing. I shall be happy to send the papers of the society, including fuller reports of Mr. Warren's proceedings, with sketches illustrating them, to any one so desiring, and I trust that I may be favoured with the kind aid of the Press and of all who sympathize with disinterested endeavours, and of the liberal contribution of every one who wishes to forward a deserving work.

Your obedient servant,

Sydenham, November 11th.

GEORGE GROVE, *Hon. Sec.*

“Jerusalem, October 2nd.

“My dear Sir,—I now send you a progress report of the works, which are getting on well. I only want gallery frames to make great way; opposition has ceased for a season, and we are prosecuting the work with all despatch. I have now about 20 men turning up the ground at the Muristan, which has assumed the appearance of Chatham lines after the commencement of the second parallel. I have found a great change in the Effendis lately; they seem to be fast losing the apprehensions with which they were at first possessed, when they thought we were here for political reasons. They begin to appreciate our efforts now they see we do nothing to harm their religion; and the strict discipline to which the workmen are subject, and the prompt payments that are made, have invested our employment with a mysterious novelty. We are getting really good work out of the men; they are gradually adopting our European notions, and a spirit of emulation has sprung up among them; instead of all wishing to be paid at the same rate, they now work hard to get on to the first class of pay. On Monday the measured work for the day shewed six cubic yards per man dug up, and thrown out from an average depth of 3 feet 6 inches. During the whole summer we have worked English hours. Sergeant Birtles is indefatigable in his exertions; he has an amount of tact and discernment

of character seldom to be met with, and I have always the satisfaction of knowing that what I leave to him will be done well. The work throughout has been of a dangerous nature, and we have hardly had an accident. I sent you by the Austrian post the impression of a signet stone found 22 feet below the surface in a shaft near the south-west angle of the Haram Area.

“ I send you a sketch of the tessellated pavement of the South Apse of the Holy Sepulchre. I will try to take a tracing, but it will not be very successful. I could see no signs of marble veneering on the walls, but there was the appearance of there having been a veneering or plaster of some kind on the stone. I have got a specimen of the rock of the Holy Sepulchre.

“ PROGRESS OF WORKS TO OCTOBER 10, 1867.

“ Shaft near S. W. Angle South Wall of Haram Area.—Depth excavated to Thursday, October 10, 76 feet. On Friday, having arrived at a depth of 79 feet, the men were breaking up a stone at the bottom of the shaft. Suddenly the ground gave way, down went the stone and the hammer, the men barely saving themselves. They at once rushed up and told the sergeant they had found the bottomless pit. I went down to the spot and examined it, and, in order that you may have an idea of the extent of our work, I will give you a description of our descent. The shaft mouth is on the south side of the Haram Wall, near the south-west angle among the prickly pears; beside it, to the east, lying against the Haram Wall, is a large mass of rubbish that has been brought up; while over the mouth itself is a triangular gin with iron wheel attached, with guy for running up the excavated soil. Looking down the shaft, one sees that it is lined for the first 20 feet with frames 4 feet 6 inches in the clear. Further down, the Haram Wall and soil cut through is seen, and a man standing at what appears to be the bottom. An order is given to this man, who repeats it, and then, faintly, is heard a sepulchral voice answering, as it were, from another world. Reaching down to the man who is visible is a 34 feet rope-ladder, and on descending by it one finds he is standing on a ledge which the ladder does not touch by 4 feet. This ledge is on the top of a wall running north and south, and abutting on the Haram Wall; its east face just cuts the centre of the shaft, which has to be canted off about 2 feet towards the east, just where some large, loose stones jut out in the most disagreeable manner. Here five more frames have been fixed to keep these stones steady. On peering down from this ledge

one sees the Haram Wall with its projecting courses until they are lost in the darkness below, observing, also, at the same time, that two sides of the shaft are cut through the soil, and are self-supporting. Now, to descend this second drop the ladder is again required; accordingly, having told the man at bottom to get under cover, it is lowered to the ledge, whence it is found that it does not reach to the bottom by several feet. It is therefore lowered the required distance, and one has to reach it by climbing down hand over hand for about 12 feet. On passing along one notes the marvellous joints of the Haram Wall stones, and also, probably, gets a few blows on the skull and knuckles from falling pebbles. Just on reaching the bottom, one recollects there is still a pit of unknown depth to be explored, and cautiously straddles across it. Then can be seen that one course in the Haram Wall, near the bottom, is quite smooth all over, the stone being finely dressed, all other courses being only well dressed, round the drafts; one also sees two stout boards lying against the Haram Wall, under which the men retire whenever an accidental shower of stones renders their position dangerous. One is now at a depth of 79 feet from the surface, and from here we commence the exploring of the "bottomless pit." After dropping a rope down, we found that it was only 6 feet deep, though it looked black enough for anything. Climbing down, we found ourselves in a passage running south from the Haram Area, 4 feet high by 2 feet wide, and we explored this passage. It is of rough rubble masonry, with flat stones at top, similar to the aqueduct from Triple Gate, but not so carefully constructed. The floor and sides are very muddy, as if water gathers there during the rainy season. It at once struck me that it was one of the overflow aqueducts from the Temple of Solomon, and that there might be a water conduit underneath; we scrambled along for a long way on our feet, our skulls and spines coming in unhappy contact with the passage roof; after about 200 feet we found that the mud reached higher up, and we had to crawl by means of elbows and toes; gradually the passage got more and more filled up, and our bodies could barely squeeze through, and there did not appear sufficient air to support us for any length of time, so that having advanced 400 feet we commenced a difficult retrograde movement, having to get back half way before we could turn our heads round. On arriving at the mouth of the passage underneath the shaft, we spent some time in examining the sides; but there is no appearance of having come under the Haram Wall. It seems to start suddenly, and I can only suppose it to have been the examining passage over an aqueduct

coming from the temple, and I am having the floor taken up to settle the question. This passage is on a level with the foundations of the Haram Wall, which are rough hewn stones, perhaps rock—I cannot tell yet. The bottom is the enormous distance of 85 feet below the surface of the ground, and as far as I can see as yet, the wall at the south-west angle must be buried for 95 feet under ground, so that it must at one time have risen to the height of 180 feet above the Tyropœon Gully. I consider it very unsafe sinking these shafts without sheathing them, but I have been obliged to do so for want of wood. In this shaft in particular there is about 60 feet unsheathed, and a loose stone from any part might stave a man's head in before he is aware of it. I think it running needlessly into danger, and I hope that with what you are sending from England and what I am getting from Malta and Alexandria I shall soon have enough to go on with in a business-like manner. The amount of wood wanted is very great. This shaft when sheeted would require 100 boards 18 feet long and 9 inches by 1 inch. We are also much in want of English dockyard rope, and rope ladders, all the work here consisting of driving shafts of great depths, it is necessary to have many ladders; we have only two, and are often in great difficulties about it. It is all very well climbing hand over hand 35 feet up a rope, when hanging in the air; but when it is in an unsheathed shaft, with the dangling bringing down the loose stones on the head, it is unsafe. The anxiety of mind caused lately, by having to keep the workmen going without adequate means for their protection, is more than I can put up willingly with any longer. We must have plenty of money for the excavation, or stop them altogether. I omitted to mention that the stones of the Haram Wall bared in this shaft are all the same size as those at the Jews' Wailing Place. I gave a description of the curious dressing of the centres of them last mail.

“Virgin's Fount, or Ain Um-ed-Deraj.—This was an excavation under the lowest step leading to the pool, in order to examine the communication by which the water enters. As the pool is usually occupied by the water-carriers during the daylight, we went down about an hour after sunset on Friday, the 4th inst., and with three fellahin of Silwân commenced removing the pebbly deposit from under the steps. The Silwân people, however, got wind of our proceedings, and came trooping down in a very excited state, and requested us to begone. By dint of chaffing they eventually changed their tone and sent us coffee. After three hours' work I found that there would be more difficulty in opening the space under the steps than I had anticipated, and hearing that

during this month there are few persons taking water from the pool, I ordered the work to be resumed in the morning. It appears that the village was divided on our account, one cantankerous Sheikh taking it into his head that we had no business out of our own country, and in the morning our men found that he had effectually stopped our resuming the work by sending a bevy of damsels there to wash. His scant wardrobe, however, did not take long to beat up, and sending down the men again in the afternoon, the pool was found untenanted, and we resumed the work and continued it on Saturday, the village taking our working anywhere as a matter of course, the Sheikh vowing vengeance on the men, and threatening to get them placed on 'the road,' which is just being commenced from here to Jaffa by forced labour. After removing the deposit under the steps for 4 feet a hard substance was reached, either masonry or rock, and, without the assistance of divers or letting the water off, it would be very difficult to continue the search in this direction any further. The other point of entrance of the water is a deep hole in the middle of the pool, at which nothing can be done. Finding our attempts thus abortive, I had the rock-cut passage to the Pool of Siloam examined, and Sergeant Birtles found two passages leading into it from the north-west, the further one being the largest, and being about 50 feet from the entrance to the pool. At this we commenced to open. It was difficult work, full of hard mud which had to be carried for 50 feet through the water of the passage, and then taken up the steps leading to the pool. The men seldom have much more than their heads above water when removing the soil, and sometimes the water suddenly rises and there is danger of their being choked. The passage was cleared out 17 feet to-day, and a small cave was arrived at, being the bottom of a deep shaft cut in the solid rock. It is difficult at present to form an opinion on the subject. We must erect a scaffolding to get to the top of the shaft, which appears at least 40 feet in height. The magnesium wire has come at a very opportuue time. I find that just where Thrupp places the ancient pool of Siloam, near the Fountain Gate, up in the town, there is a tank of enormous dimensions, which I have not yet been able to visit, and the aqueduct from Solomon's Pools runs within a few feet of it and could fill it. The place is called Burg al Kibryt on the Ordnance Survey plan 1:2500.

"Jerusalem, October 12th

"I send you by this mail three descriptions of valuable discoveries we have made this week about Jerusalem—viz., at the Virgin's Fount,

south-west angle of Haram Area and Muristan. I have this week been down to Wady Kelt, and traced it up to the Fârah, but I must defer the account until next mail. I wish to call your attention particularly to the deep shafts we have sunk lately. It is absolutely necessary, if this sort of work is to be continued, that the public should give with sufficient liberality to enable me to conduct the works in perfect safety to those who are employed continually under ground. The shaft at the south-west angle is a prodigious depth, and not half so safe as I should like. With reference to the south wall of Haram Area, you see by the enclosed tracing that the south-west angle carries off the palm with regard to height. I was much astonished at the result of our labour, not expecting to find the Tyropœon Gallery more than 50 feet deep, and it must be, I think, upwards of 100 feet. The east side of this valley must break down in a very abrupt manner if the lowest part is west of the Haram Area. As for the passage we found running south, I do not know what to make of it; since writing the progress report the men have broken through the bottom of the passage, and found solid rock. No wonder the poor Queen of Sheba's spirit failed her, when she saw the stupendous ascent which must have led over the Tyropœon Gulley. I am glad to hear that the negatives have arrived safely; you will find one, of the Bridge at Amman, taken from about the same spot as the picture by Mr. W. Tipping, of which an engraving is inserted in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. An examination of the two fully bears out the character this gentleman has obtained for accuracy in his sketches of the Holy Land.

PROGRESS OF WORK TO 22ND OF OCTOBER, 1867.

“Shaft at south-west angle, $87\frac{1}{2}$ feet deep.—At 350 feet along passage, a branch gallery from east was found, but it was impossible to clear out the deposit, as this portion was only reached by crawling. The owner of the soil began to humbug about us being so long on his ground; I therefore have had the shaft filled up, much to his disgust, as he had begun to look upon it as an annuity. The position of the passage has been fixed on the outside of the city walls, so that we can gain access at any time by sinking a shaft at Ophel. We are so much in want of wood, that the few frames which will be liberated will come in very handy. This shaft will be closed to-day.

“Virgin's Fount.—You may have been surprised last week, when I described the finding the passage leading north as a discovery, after what Dr. Barclay, of the United States, says in his book about it; but

I am prepared to shew that in this instance he has misrepresented the facts of the case, and mistaking the main drain outside for a water conduit, has led his readers to believe that he has been up this conduit, which ends in a shaft over 40 feet high, the passage to which was for 17 feet closed with what appears to be the deposit of centuries. Next week I will send you a fuller account of this passage, as to-morrow I hope to be able to get the scaffolding up; it will be a tough job. Another small passage has been cleared out about 40 feet from entrance from fount; it goes in for 9 feet and suddenly terminates.

“Single Gate.—In a former letter I stated that I believed there was another system of vaults under the present vaults at south-east angle, and in a sketch at the same time I shewed a point where I expected the entrance would be, under the Single Gate. I have been foiled once or twice in getting to this point; first the shaft failed, and when we had driven the second we had to wait till we could scrape together some gallery frames; finally we drove the gallery to the point I had indicated under the Single Gate, and on Wednesday, to our great delight, the hoped-for entrance was found. We were, however, both too ill to stay and explore it, and I had it covered up again. Yesterday we re-opened it, and Sergeant Birtles set about getting out the *débris*. The entrance was into a passage which appeared to be blocked up—suddenly a crash and the passage appeared clear and unencumbered, but after getting in Sergeant Birtles brought down another fall, and was blocked up in the passage without a light for two hours. It is quite clear now, the rubbish having settled at the bottom. I send you a plan which I made yesterday immediately it was open; you will see that the stones are of great size, one of them 15 feet long, nearly all are bevilled and beautifully worked, but some of them are only hammer-dressed. The passage is 3 feet wide, and is perpendicular to the south wall of Haram Area, running between the piers which support the vaults above. After 60 feet the roof stones disappear. On the east there is a passage blocked up, and also there is a second entrance above that by which we got in. The roof is composed of large stones, many of them levelled, and laid flat on the upper course of the passage wall. This upper course is 4 feet in height, and at the bottom of it on each side is the remains of a small aqueduct jutting out from the wall, made of dark cement. The passage is probably from 12 feet to 18 feet high, its roof is 20 feet below the surface of ground in Haram Vaults, or about 60 feet below the level of Haram Area. At the point B on plan, there are indications of there having been a metal gate. A check, 10 inches cube, is cut in one of the

roof stones, and there is the mark of abrasion on one of the stones, as if a metal door had swung against it; radius of swing about 13 inches. At present I have no clue as to the use of this passage.

"Muristan,—Small arches are found all over the place—piers about 12 feet to 14 feet apart. They are probably Crusaders' work, as I understand the Mahomedans have never built here, the place having been cursed after they captured Jerusalem. Detailed information in my next.

"CHARLES WARREN, Lieutenant, Royal Engineers.

"Jerusalem, Oct. 22nd."

Another letter embodying similar materials was addressed by Mr. Grove to the *Guardian* in November, and subsequently another to the same paper. As the last is of a practical turn we reprint it:—

"I beg leave to return my very sincere thanks to those of your readers who have so kindly responded to the appeal in my letter in the *Guardian* of the 20th ult. But I cannot resist, even at the risk of appearing importunate, from again urging the subject of the exploration of Jerusalem upon your readers. I feel sure that my letter has either escaped notice, or that it has failed to convey the urgency and importance of the subject, or I should have received a larger number of replies than I have received. Surely no earnest member of the Anglican Church, especially no clergyman, however he may be pressed with other demands of other works of mercy and charity, can contemplate the work in which we are engaged and not be moved to support it, either with purse or pen. For that work is nothing less than the revealing of that ancient city which must be of far more interest to him than any other place in the world. And not only of interest, but also of practical moment, for think of the light which will be thrown on the Bible—Prophets, Kings, Maccabees, Gospels—when we have ascertained the real formation of the ground, and the dimensions and positions of the buildings as they then were. And as no book demands such patience and reverent commentary more than the Bible, so will no city yield richer fruit to the explorer than Jerusalem. No place was ever more varied in its natural features, before that vast cascade of rubbish, which Lieutenant Warren has been the first to penetrate, was poured over its cliffs and into its ravines; over no ancient buildings have there been such fierce or such hopeless conflicts waged as over the Temple and the Holy Sepulchre. Hopeless till now: but *now* full of promise and encouragement, if only I can arouse the attention of those most deeply interested in the subject. I know only too well that to those who are not already conversant with the details, the discoveries hitherto made are trivial

and fragmentary. I fully admit it. But every mail from Jerusalem brings me fresh fragments, and before long there will be enough to put together into a whole of symmetry and instruction. It is a case analogous to the morsels of Assyrian libraries, over which Sir Henry Rawlinson and Mr. Norris have so long and so patiently laboured. Who would have conjectured, when those baskets of rubbish were brought into the British Museum, that by patiently putting them together they could at length be read, and so much discovered of the literature, art, and history of the people? And so it will be here; only we must first get the fragments: and that is what I want your readers to help me to. The clergy of our Church are always learned, able and intelligent, often rich, oftener still able to command the purses of the laity. Let it not be said, I earnestly entreat, that they refused their help to a cause which appeals so loudly to them in all respects as does the exploration of Jerusalem.

“GEORGE GROVE, Hon. Sec. Palestine Exploration Fund.”

Royal Asiatic Society.—November 18.—Viscount Strangford President, in the chair.—Sir H. B. E. Frere, Col. H. A. Ouvry, and Mr. J. B. Norton, were elected resident Members, and Karsandás Mútji a non-resident Member.—The paper read was by Dr. G. Oppert, ‘On Abyssinia and Prester John.’ The author began by sketching the various incidents in the history of Europe which at one time favoured the identification of Prester John with the Negus of Abyssinia from the end of the fourteenth century to about 1632, when with the overthrow of the authority of the Negus, the belief that he was Prester John subsided. He then gave an account of the attempts which have been made at explaining the name of Prester John, and proposed another explanation, suggested by a comparison of the earliest historical documents in which the name occurs, identifying him with the Korkhan or sovereign of the Kara Khitai, a Tungusian race who founded in A.D. 1125 a powerful empire in High Asia, which continued for nearly a hundred years. With regard to the title of Prester, *i. e.* Presbyter, the writer shewed that the Korkhan, whom the Sarazens called an infidel Turk, was generally believed to be a Nestorian Christian, and that with the Nestorians, who had at that time spread over the whole of Eastern Asia, the dignity of Presbyter was a very common one, inasmuch as, according to Rubruquis, it was customary with nearly all the male population of the Nestorians in the remoter parts of Eastern Asia to receive the priestly ordination.

END OF VOLUME II. (FIFTH SERIES).



